

DE BOW'S REVIEW

VOLUME XXXII

1862

AMS PRESS, INC. • NEW YORK • 1967

AMS PRESS, INC.

New York, N. Y. 10003

1967

Manufactured in the United States of America

DE BOW'S REVIEW

AND

Industrial Resources, Statistics, etc.

DEVOTED TO

COMMERCE, AGRICULTURE, MANUFACTURES, INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS, POLITICAL
ECONOMY, GENERAL LITERATURE, ETC.

“Commerce is King.”

EDITED BY

J. D. B. DE BOW,

PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY, ETC., IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA;
SUPERINTENDANT U. S. CENSUS.

VOL. XXXII

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,

AND

CHARLESTON, S. C.

1862 ,

AMS PRESS, INC.

New York, N. Y. 10003

1967

Manufactured in the United States of America

VOLUME XXXII

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1862

ARTICLE.	PAGE.
I.—SOUTHERN CIVILIZATION: OR THE NORMAN IN AMERICA, by J. QUITMAN MOORE, of Louisiana	1
II.—CALHOUN AND WEBSTER, by W. ARCHER COCKE, of Virginia	19
III.—MANUFACTURE OF WINES IN THE SOUTH, by DR. WM. HUME, of So. Carolina	46
IV.—DR. CARTWRIGHT ON THE NEGRO, REVIEWED, by DR. MAYES, of Mississippi	54
V.—EXPERIENCES OF THE PAST—OUR GUIDE FOR THE FUTURE . . .	63
VI.—THE LOYALTY OF THE BORDER STATES, by R. R. WELFORD, of Virginia	81
VII.—AGRICULTURAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE SOUTH, by T. G. CLEMSEN, of South Carolina, (late of the U.S. Agricultural Bureau.) . .	87
VIII.—THE PIONEERS OF KENTUCKY	103
IX.—THE EXISTING CRISIS, by DR. CARTWRIGHT, of New Orleans . . .	109
X.—CONFEDERATED REPUBLICANISM OR MONARCHY, by PROF. GEO. E. DABNEY, of Virginia	113
XI.—COMMERCIAL IMPORTANCE AND FUTURE OF THE SOUTH . .	120
XII.—SOCIETY, LABOR, CAPITAL, & c., by GEO. FITZHUGH, of Virginia .	134
XIII.—CONDUCT OF THE WAR, by GEORGE FITZHUGH, of Virginia	139
XIV.—HUDIBRAS AND PETER PINDAR	146
XV.—ESSAY ON THE MANAGEMENT OF SLAVES	154
XVI.—WHAT WE ARE GAINING BY THE WAR	158
Editorial.—	161

VOLUME XXXII

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MARCH AND APRIL, 1862

ARTICLE.	PAGE.
I.—SOMERSET'S CASE, by B. R. WELLFORD, JR., of Virginia	171
II.—SOUTHERN SOCIETY AND BRITISH CRITICS, by J. T. WISWALL, of Alabama	187
III.—HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERN- MENT IN EUROPE, by M. GUIZOT, by G. FITZHUGH, of Virginia . . .	199
IV.—SHALL WE HAVE A NAVY? SHALL WE PURSUE THE DEFENSIVE POLICY, OR INVADE THE ENEMY'S COUNTRY?, by J. QUITMAN MOORE, of Mississippi	211
V.—MOTLEY'S HISTORY OF THE UNITED NETHERLANDS, by W. ARCHER COCKE, of Virginia	223
VI.—DR. CARTWRIGHT REVIEWED—THE NEGRO, APE AND SER- PENT, by DR. B. B. MAYS, of Mississippi	238
VII.—MANUFACTURE OF WINES IN THE SOUTH, by DR. WM. HUME, of South Carolina	251
VIII.—THE COTTON INTEREST, AND ITS RELATION TO THE PRESENT CRISIS, by J. B. GRIBBLE, of New Orleans	279
IX.—MORAL AND NATURAL LAW CONTRADISTINGUISHED, by —	286
X.—ABOLITIONISM, A CURSE TO THE NORTH, AND A BLESSING TO THE SOUTH, by DR. CARTWRIGHT, of New Orleans	295
XI.—COMMERCIAL ENFRANCHISEMENT OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES	304
XII.—THE RIGHTS OF SECESSION AND COERCION	305
XIII.—CAUSE AND CONTRAST—THE AMERICAN CRISIS	307
XIV.—THE PINE TREES OF LOWER NORTH CAROLINA AND VIRGINIA	325
XV.—WHAT WE ARE GAINING BY THE WAR	327
Editorial.—	334

DE BOW S REVIEW.

ESTABLISHED JANUARY, 1846.

JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1862.

VOL. XXXII, O. S.] ENLARGED SERIES. [VOL. VII, Nos. 1 & 2, N. S.

ART. I.—SOUTHERN CIVILIZATION: OR, THE NORMAN IN AMERICA.

The philosophy of history finds no more conspicuous or forcible illustration than that presented in the rise, progress and final consolidation into a vital nationality, of those grand ideas—the gift of a former age, and the monuments of an historic race—that have but lately torn a continent asunder, and revived the traditional glory of the Cavalier on a theatre, which has been called to exhibit the grand drama of a nation's life, abruptly concluded with the first fitful and inauspicious act. And seated amid the prostrate columns and broken arches of the once stately edifice, the political inquirer is at but little loss to discover the deep causes that have effected the mighty overthrow. And in tracing them back to their original sources, these active agents of dissolution and decay will be found to lose themselves in the exciting events and transactions of that brilliant and memorable era of English history embraced in the eventful reigns of the proud sovereigns of the houses of Tudor and Stuart.

The overthrow of the great feudal aristocracy of England marked the commencement of a revolution in the British constitution, which, in one brief century, beheld the whole mass of political power (once shared between the king and the parliament) transferred to the Crown. Under the Plantagenet princes, the Government of England was more an aristocracy than a monarchy, and the conflict was carried on between the Crown and the great barons, headed by such chiefs as Richard Nevil, Earl of Warwick, who often united with the people against the throne, and, not infrequently, overawed majesty itself. But, under the Tudors, the Government made an approach to the absolute type, and sought to centre in itself all the scattered rays of civil jurisdiction. But while this rapid centralization of authority was going on in the Crown, and the

great vassals once king-makers and the haughty compeers of kings, were descending to the condition of subjects, a great power was growing up in the body of the nation, destined, in the course of a few centuries, to convulse it to its centre. The free towns which had sprung up at intervals from the bosom of feudal society, and taken their place in the new social organization, became the great centres of art and trade, and introduced a new element into society—the monied power—which was not long in finding its way into the higher sphere of government and politics. Nobility, which, in the sixteenth century, had been held above price, became, in the seventeenth, a marketable commodity, and James I established and carried on a profitable traffic in titles. Henry VIII, the ablest and most arbitrary of the long line of Tudor sovereigns, had, by repudiating the Vatican and assuming the mitre, carried the prerogatives of the Crown to a degree formidable to the liberties of the subject, and transferred against his own throne the opposition and enmity which the Lollard or Puritan sectaries—afterward a powerful and triumphant party—had previously directed against the See of Rome. And by throwing England outside the pale of the Catholic nations, he had offered violence to that great principle of race which has given the Celtic or Latin, of which the Norman is the most powerful branch, and the Teutonic or Saxon nations distinct and opposite destinies; the former inclining to monarchy, or aristocracy and catholicity; the latter to representative institutions and protestantism. The Norman had conquered the Anglo-Saxon, and during the long dynasty of the Plantagenets, maintained his supremacy among the nations, and stood at the head of European civilization; but, with the rise of the commercial spirit under the reign of Henry VIII, and its double alliance with the democratic principle and the genius of a lawless, intolerant and proscriptive semi-religious fanaticism, commenced the attempted conquest of the Norman by the Saxon, which, prosecuted with various success under the reigns of Mary, Elizabeth and James, finally gained a violent and bloody triumph in the overthrow and execution of the unfortunate Charles Stuart. To such as content themselves with mere exoteric views of history, without investigating its more hidden exoteric phenomena, the separation of Henry from the communion of Rome would appear to have been a purely religious movement; but to such as obtain a closer and more interior view of the motives, measures and policy of that reign, the course of that great monarch will be found to have been guided mainly by powerful and controlling political considerations. Princes and cabinets know too well the use of the religious element in the economy of society, to become themselves the blind dupes of its vagaries. Hume represents Henry and Elizabeth as being protestants “more from necessity than conviction,” and sacri-

ficing their own preferences and prejudices—if, indeed, they had any—to great and imperious exigencies of State. A period had finally arrived in the progress of civilization, when it had become necessary to subordinate the ecclesiastical to the civil jurisdiction, in order to preserve the integrity and solidarity of the nationalities from the absorbing and centralizing tendency of the great Roman colossus that had danced the infancy of modern society on its knee, and conducted it safely through the long night of the middle age, only to seek to fetter the strong limbs of its manhood with the swaddling clothes of the nursery. That period fell in the reign of the great Tudor king, and he met the occasion with all the vigor and courage of his great and unmatched faculties. The chair of St. Peter claimed and exercised the right of appointing Italian bishops to the vacant English Sees, and of compelling the potentates of Europe to do homage to the Papal nuncio—two impositions that were cheerfully submitted to, so long as they symbolized a submission to the merely spiritual supremacy of the Roman pontiff; but when the grasping power of the hierarchy, stimulated by the genius of the great Hildebrand, set up its claim to the exercise of a temporal jurisdiction over Christendom, a chord of exquisite sensibility was touched, which vibrated to the heart of Europe. The great principle of nationality was assailed; the Saxon love of independence, the Norman pride of empire and command, the deep and ineradicable instinct and prejudice of race, received a smarting wound, and Henry decided to make his marriage the instrument for effecting a separation from Rome. He declared England forever independent of the Holy See, subordinated the ecclesiastical to the civil power, and levelled every barrier that stood in the way of augmenting the royal authority. Wolsey, the last, ablest and most powerful of the great ecclesiastics who acted as prime ministers to the Crown, was banished; his successors, More and Cromwell, were condemned to the scaffold, and protestants and catholics were persecuted with equal severity. The divorce between the ecclesiastical and civil polity was final and complete; and the executive branch of the Government, by being armed with the formidable legislative power of taxation, in the right granted it of levying tonnage and poundage at will, grew to such threatening proportions as to overshadow the other departments of the public administration, and destroy the balance of the ancient constitution. The House of Lords shared the legislative functions with the throne, and was, at the same time, the supreme judicature of the land, yet never acted but to register the decisions of the Crown; and the Commons House of Parliament met, and held its sessions only by the extremest courtesy.

Henry was an admirer of the polity of the Roman Church, and would have preferred to have continued in its communion,

had it been content to confine its jurisdiction to spiritual matters, and had the social condition of England not suggested, and compelled, the idea of a separation as a matter of royal policy. But, if the right of nominating foreigners to the vacant English Sees were allowed the court of Rome, England would be speedily denationalized, inasmuch as it would be suffering a foreign Government to exercise legislative functions within its own jurisdiction; since, by the constitution of England, bishops were created spiritual lords, and sat in parliament with the temporal peers. The catholic hierarchy had, from the small, pastoral patrimony of St. Peter, grown to the dimensions of a great and powerfully organized temporal government, building up its gigantic power on the basis of an immense superstition, thrusting itself, at every turn, into the affairs of nations, and animated by the grand idea of obliterating the boundaries of great States, striking down the nationalities, and founding, on the site of the ancient pagan civilization, a huge, colossal and centralized despotism, that aspired to march, under the banner of catholic unity, to the empire of the world. The conception was worthy of Hildebrand; but its failure will stand a perpetual monument to the indestructibility of the sentiment of nationality, and the vital and indomitable power of the genius and instinct of race. But Henry repudiated the despotic domination of Rome, only to establish a more centralized authority at home. He was not unaware that, by creating himself Pope, he would fall to all the odium attaching to that office; but was complacent in the thought that he would be, at least, an *English* pontiff, and would cause the junction of the civil and ecclesiastical authority to contribute, still further, to the enlargement of the royal power. He succeeded; and gave to England an administration at once vigorous, splendid and arbitrary; and his reign may be fixed upon as the seed-time of the modern political parties—especially of those celebrated historical organizations known as Whig and Tory, Roundhead and Cavalier.

Wyckliffe had ushered in the reformation in England, by preaching against the Pope of Rome; the successors of Wyckliffe now continued the reformation, by preaching against the Pope of England; but Henry knew his strength, and put down opposition with a violent arm, while attempting to carry out, on a more limited theatre, the chimerical idea of Hildebrand, of creating a powerful and united empire out of distinct races, and opposite and antagonist forms of civilization. The blood of the Saxon continued still to beat strongly in the veins of feudal England, while the banner of the Norman, the proud emblem of authority, flaunted from the battlements of the conqueror. True to the ideas and instincts of his Northern origin, the Saxon clung to that fierce and lawless individualism in state, and that stern, gloomy and impracticable idealism in church, which his rude Teutonic fathers brought with them from the

wild Hercynian forests. And when the ecclesiastical power of England was withdrawn from the Vatican and transferred to Canterbury, this Saxon element became the fortress and arsenal of that violent and fanatical party of political and religious revolutionists, known as Puritans, Independents, or Presbyterians, who opposed equally the English Establishment, as an infringement upon the rights of conscience, and the civil government as an enemy to individual liberty. The Puritan became to protestantism what the Jesuit was to catholicism—the slave to one despotic idea, and the secret foe to all government, society and institutions that stood between him and the consummation of his gigantic conception. To this party eagerly attached themselves all that restless, selfish, arrogant and ambitious class, which commerce had elevated to sudden importance, with no principle but their passions, no opinion but their interests, and no faith but their fanaticism. And the machinations of this presbyterian, or Puritan party, was but the herculean effort of the Saxon to wrest from the Norman the scepter of empire, making religious fanaticism only the cloak for concealing his political designs. It reared its crest against the authority and majesty of the State, and was persecuted by Henry, Mary and Elizabeth, not because it was a religious sect, but for the reason that it was a public enemy, committing treason against the State. It was in the designs and pretensions of this party, that the inquisitorial tribunals of the High Commission and Star Chamber had their origin; and when the interior history of the reigns of the sovereigns of the houses of Tudor and Stuart is studied, the discovery will be made that much of what had the appearance of being arbitrary and despotic in their administrations, was but the result of an honest endeavor to uphold the Government against the assaults of this revolutionary faction. Arbitrary as they were, these two extraordinary courts fully accomplished the object of their institution. They broke the power and spirit of a dangerous and formidable party, and drove many of its most turbulent and discontented spirits to found a colony on the shores of Massachusetts bay.

The power of the Norman in England was still supreme, when the morning of the seventeenth century found Charles Stuart seated on the British throne. There, in all save the petition of right, stood the English constitution, just as Henry VIII had left it;—the throne standing in isolated power—the House of Lords a branch of the Crown—the Commons tenants by courtesy—tonnage and poundage royal prerogatives—the High Commission and Star Chamber unabolished, and Buckingham and Laud occupying, in undiminished power, the high offices which, under the great Tudor, Cromwell and Cranmer filled. But, in all things else, there had been wrought a great and wonderful change. Wherever the eye might turn it was

met by evidences of a social and material progress, far in advance of the political and intellectual development. The physical features of the country, even, were no longer the same. Commerce and the arts had built up large towns, and drawn to these more active centres of industry and enterprise a large part of the rural population, whose former occupation had been the exclusive cultivation of the soil; communication between place and place had increased, and the ancient cities, long stationary in population and trade, grew to great and sudden opulence. Nor were the social changes less marked than the physical. Villeinage had almost wholly disappeared; the dignities of church and State had become more accessible to worth and merit; great talents and meritorious services were not infrequently rewarded with the star and garter, and the distance between the noble and the commoner was greatly narrowed. But, when the eye was turned from the contemplation of these social phenomena to a survey of the political institutions of the country, it required no remarkable strength of observation to discover that there were two distinct nationalities existing on the soil of Great Britain; and of the two, the Norman was the ruler. The Teutonic and the Latin—the Northern and the Southern—types of civilization, with their diverse social systems, their incompatibility of ideas, opinions and institutions, and their ineradicable national prejudices, were brought into the presence of each other, under the exigencies of a compulsory political union; and so long as the dominant race maintained the principles and institutions that were the native outgrowth of its civilization, its ascendancy was complete. Aristocracy, based upon the feudal relation, is the natural expression of the political thought of the Norman—a social condition, resting on the principle of subordination, and recognizing the family as the primary basis of the social union. Democracy, founded upon the idea of an unlimited individualism, and without any reference to the conservative organism of institutions, is the fundamental conception of the political philosophy of the Teuton or Saxon. The English constitution is the result of a compromise between these two hostile systems, with the Norman element always in the ascendant, save during the brief reign of Cromwell.

When, therefore, the rapid growth of the commercial and industrial arts had developed a new order in the State and given enlarged, organized and concentrated power to the democratic elements; while the constitution remained much as the early Norman kings had made it, a collision between the two systems became inevitable, and the originally hostile races—Norman and Saxon—now assumed the shape of two equally hostile parties—the Cavalier and Puritan. Since the overthrow of the power of the great barons, under Edward IV, the Crown and the aristocracy had become united, and the contest for power grew

to be one between the throne and the aristocracy on the one hand, and the commons on the other, now coalesced, under the reign of Charles, into the powerful and fanatical party of Independents, upon whose hands rests the blood of the murdered king. Their leaders, Hampden, Russell, Cromwell and Vane, were not wanting in many of the higher qualities of statesmanship; but, being idealists in politics, and fanatics in religion, they became only grand architects of ruin, and left behind them nothing so imperishable as their crimes and folly. The question with this great and triumphant party was not one of liberty but of power, as the despotic government of Cromwell afterward shewed. Even the bard, whose celestial lyre sang the sublime epic of the fall, became a placeman, and received a pension for justifying the regicide. And when the king, in conformity with immemorial custom, levied the tax of ship-money on the seaport towns, in order to raise a fleet to protect the English coasts from the hostile designs of France, this powerful and restless revolutionary party rose in open revolt, and brought about that fatal rupture between the parliament and the Crown which finally brought the Cavalier and the Roundhead in stern encounter, and wrote the history of that day in their mingled blood. Touching the merits of this great controversy, the opinion of the world will always be divided—Hume and Macaulay having taken opposite sides; but it will be generally agreed upon the one point, that had the party which found itself placed in opposition to the court been any other than the *Puritan*, there had been no civil war, no subversion of the institutions of the monarchy, no inhuman murder of the king. A compromise would have been effected, the constitution would have been amended, and the power of the Crown settled without shock, as it was, twenty years afterward, at the restoration. But the Roundhead, at once a religious fanatic and a political agitator and reformer, could conceive of no government but the rule of the Saints, and form no other idea of the principles of civil liberty than what the levelling philosophy of the covenant taught. A bigot in faith and an idealist in speculation, his sentiments were violent and his convictions impracticable. A visionary from principle and a revolutionist from interest, his prejudices allowed no compromise, while his passions fed equally the flame of his cupidity and ambition. Austere in his morals and inflexible in his principles, he set up his own conduct as the standard of right, and sought to dictate the opinions and control the convictions of others. Rude in his manners and morose in his disposition, he practiced the profoundest dissimulation, while obtaining credit for sincerity, and concealed his real character and designs under the cloak of hypocrisy. Not deficient in courage nor wanting in sagacity, these great qualities were yet so obscured and controlled by craft and duplicity as to deny them a place among the high

and magnanimous sentiments. Firm, energetic, and indomitable of purpose, he accomplished his ends by means which neither a high sense of honor nor a genuine morality would stoop to sanction, and relied for the achievement of his plans more upon the force of physical than moral and intellectual agencies. And deriving his strength more from passion than principle, and looking rather to immediate successes than to general results, the moment of his seemingly greatest power was always his weakest, from an inability to grasp and combine in a mass what he had the capacity only to master in detail. He overthrew in a day what it had required ten centuries to build up, and finally fell, overwhelmed, amid the very ruins himself had made.

Opposite, under the banner of the king, stood the Cavalier—the builder, the social architect, the institutionalist, the conservator—the advocate of rational liberty and the supporter of authority, as against the licentiousness and morbid impulse of unregulated passion and unenlightened sentiment. No idealist, enthusiast or speculative system-builder, upheaving ancient landmarks and overthrowing venerable monuments; but a realist, a practical and enlightened utilitarian, bowing to the authority of experience and acknowledging the supremacy of ideas, forms and institutions that had received the hallowing sanction of time. An institutor by genius and a ruler by race, his pride was at once the source of his most eminent virtues and greatest weaknesses, while honor was the touchstone to his character. Chivalrous in sentiment and magnanimous in deed, glory was his ambition, and loyalty the inspirer of his every thought, impulse and action. Elevated in his ideas and tolerant in his views, his selfishness was vicarious and his very faults wore the semblance of virtue. Unyielding in his principles, but compromising in his opinions, his conduct was governed more by sentiment than reflection, and more by association than either. Courtly in his manners and splendid in his tastes, a knightly generosity he practised even toward his foes, and never lost his faculties in volumpuousness. Without being an abject advocate of passive obedience or a supporter of arbitrary power, he yet took ground against the revolutionary party, not as an enemy to liberal institutions or a well-regulated liberty: but, discovering in the doctrines and principles of the revolution a greater danger to the social and political system than from the alleged existing abuses, he preferred yielding his loyalty rather to institutions than abstractions, and felt it a duty to attempt to quench the lights of the incendiary philosophy, whose torch had been applied to the noblest monuments of civil wisdom yet erected by the genius of man.

These were the parties that met on Naseby field under the hostile banners of Fairfax and Rupert, and from which have

sprung the two nationalities that now divide the empire of the American continent. They stand to-day as they stood two centuries ago, when England was the theatre of their conflicts, and a licentious liberty and an enlightened conservatism the opposite principles for which they respectively fought. The Roundhead, violent innovator and ruthless iconoclast, as of old, has arrayed him against the majesty of institutions and planted his feet on the great charter of the public liberties. The Cavalier has rallied to the rescue of the one, and defended from desecration the other. And standing on the soil beneath which slumber the ashes of the great Cavalier, he beholds surviving around him, unimpaired, the noble monuments which the free genius of the Norman founded. And looking back from the standpoint of the present, upon the regular historical development connecting the history of the civilization of Europe with that of America, the establishment by the Southern commonwealths of an independent nationality is discovered to be the result of an original destiny and the unfolding of a grand and exciting drama, whose concluding act, as of old, finds the Norman seated on the throne of independent power. The civilization of the Southern commonwealths of America being like the Roman, derivative, not original, its historical development has been but the natural evolution, on a newer and wider theatre, of the ideas, opinions and institutions of its celebrated Anglo-Norman antetype. With the exception of the French and Spanish settlements of Louisiana and Florida, and the small colony of Huguenots who erected their altars on the banks of the Ashley and Cooper rivers, the States of the South were founded almost exclusively by colonists owing allegiance to the British Crown. Ireland, Scotland and Wales contributed equally with the softer Latin races of Andalusia and Languedoc to the formation of a composite Southern nationality; but the English became early the controlling and informing element, that finally succeeded in moulding the character, and shaping the thought and policy, of the nascent young commonwealths.

The Governments of the Southern colonies being proprietary and provincial, in contradistinction to the charter Governments founded by the Roundheads, the connection between the former and the parent Government was more intimate and endearing than that which existed between it and its Puritan dependencies to the northward. This fact exercised an important and controlling influence upon the genius and character of the Cavalier settlements, and contributed more than any other existing cause to the formation of feelings, sentiments, prejudices and passions; which, even at that early day, drew a strong line of separation between distinct peoples and alien communities, and prepared the way, through the violent excesses and demoralizing action of a majority Government, to the establishment of Southern independence.

Maryland, Virginia and Carolina became, under the colonial *régime*, the flourishing centres of Anglo-Norman culture and enterprise in the West; and reflected with singular fidelity, in every sphere of moral, social and intellectual action, the great thoughts and ideas, the deep impulses and convictions, that were recognized as being the peculiar offspring of British genius. By that same instinctive prejudice and prepossession which moved Cromwell, Hampden and Ireton, when the fortunes of the Puritan party in England were at their nadir, and they had decided to emigrate to America, and choose the New England settlements for their future home, were the Cavaliers, the gentry and the loyal yeomanry of England led to establish their hearthstones in the Southern colonies. Here the social, civil and ecclesiastical systems of England had taken deep root, and found expression in ideas, habits, manners and customs that gave these colonies a marked individuality, and mapped out for them an independent destiny. In Virginia, especially, was the sentiment of loyalty and attachment to the mother country peculiarly strong, resulting in the formation of opinions, feelings, prejudices and associations, that continued to preserve much of their original force long after the province became an independent commonwealth. When the triumph of the Puritan party in England had elevated Cromwell to the throne, and the adherents of the house of Stuart were secretly conspiring the overthrow of the usurper, in order to effect the restoration of Charles II, the great landholders of Virginia gave their support to the royal cause, and Richard Lee, of the "Northern Neck," was deputed by them to visit the royal exile in Flanders, and tender him their aid; evidencing that loyal attachment to constitutional principles, and that superior regard for conservative views and institutional forms, which continue to distinguish their latest descendants. Even the Declaration of Independence, an instrument drawn up by a Virginia statesman, whose extreme Jacobin principles led him to the adoption of a political creed bordering almost on licentiousness, contemplated less an attack upon the form than a violent opposition to the abuses of the British Government; and if the administration of Lord North had pursued a conciliatory policy, there is every reason to believe that Virginia, and the other Southern colonies, would have remained loyal to the British Crown. The scions of the leading patrician families of these colonies were sent abroad to receive their training at the celebrated seats of British learning, and their public men took their first lessons in statesmanship and administration from the great leaders who guided the destinies of the British empire. So close, intimate and endearing were the bonds uniting the parent to the offspring that, even after the sword had been invoked to vindicate their rights, a lingering feeling of attachment to the mother country was the uppermost senti-

ment in the minds of the Southern provinces. "Many of those," observes Washington Irving, "most active in asserting colonial independence, and Washington among the number, still indulge the hope of an eventual reconciliation; while few entertained, or at least avowed, the idea of a complete separation." The Southern delegates, in the second congress, went so far as to move a resolution to tender a second "humble and dutiful" petition to the king, but the measure was vehemently voted down by the *New England* delegation, headed by John Adams, who "condemned it as an imbecile measure, calculated to embarrass the proceedings of congress; he was for prompt and vigorous action." But when the repeated arbitrary measures of the British cabinet left no possible hope of a pacific adjustment of the pending difficulties, and it was evident a war of subjugation was designed against the colonies, "all Virginia," writes Irving, "was in combustion. The standard of liberty was reared in every county; there was a general cry to arms." And even after active hostilities had commenced, Washington, writing to his friend Sir William Fairfax, then in England, speaks of the rupture as a "deplorable affair," and imputing the blame to the ministry and their military agents, concludes: "Unhappy it is to reflect that a brother's sword has been sheathed in a brother's breast, and that the once happy and peaceful plains of America are to be either drenched with blood, or inhabited by slaves. Sad alternative! But can a virtuous man hesitate in his choice?" This deeply-rooted attachment of the Southern colonies to the institutions of the British monarchy, had its origin in the native reverence of the Cavalier for the authority of established forms over mere speculative ideas; and this original sentiment was greatly strengthened and supported by the influence of a domestic institution, all of whose relations had their foundation in a social condition, resting on the principle of inequality and subordination, and favoring a public polity embodying the ideas of this social status. And, after the revolution came and swept away every vestige of the political authority of Great Britain, the imposing monuments of its noble civilization still survive to perpetuate the achievements of its civic genius, and assert the grandeur of its intellectual empire. Around these the young Southern commonwealths gathered, and transferred to them that loyalty and devotion which they had once given to the ancestral Government; and what it had been to them in point of influence and authority, they now became to the young empires that sprung up from the depths of the southern forest—the founders of their social systems, and the arbiters of their destiny. In this great work of colonization and empire Virginia took the lead, and became the august mother of that beautiful sisterhood of States, dwelling in the bosom of the Mississippi valley, and stretching along the shores of the Mexican gulf, whose won-

derful geographical configuration, vast productive resources, and identity of ideas, pursuits, interests and institutions, united them in the bonds of a common destiny, pointing to an inevitable future nationality. Their political constitutions were modelled upon that of the parent State; and from the same source sprung the genius of their public policy, civil administration, and social manners, producing a uniformity of opinion and homogeneity of interests, capable of being made the basis of the most powerful political combinations.

This Cavalier, or Anglo-Norman element that had presided at the founding of the original Southern colonies, entered largely into the composition of the new populations; which, spreading to the southward, and mingling the refinement of the courtier with the energy of the pioneer, planted the civilization of Europe along the great Southern seaboard and beside the mighty tomb of De Soto. They carried with them that same deep, master-passion—an abiding attachment to landed possession and territorial power, which is the secret of the universal dominion and ascendancy of the Norman race—and laid the foundation of a great, agricultural empire. This fact gave to Southern civilization a character, radically different and distinct from either that of the Roman or the Roundhead, which made the city and municipality the grand centre and integer, around which was concentrated the whole mass of political authority; while the Southern was predial and territorial, assimilating it, in all but the political power resulting from territorial possession, to its original Norman type. In its social and domestic features it presented all the elements of an aristocracy, while politically it exhibited all the characteristics of an absolute democracy. In Virginia, so long as primogeniture and entails obtained, and the elective franchise was limited to freehold qualification, political power was, mainly, in the hands of the great landholders, who gave to the country so many of the illustrious names that adorn its annals, and acted as a conservative counterpoise to the excesses of the democratic principle; but that fatal political association of the Cavalier with the Puritan, under the Government of the American Union, held together by the parchment bonds of a majority constitution, was but the organization of revolution and the negation of liberty. The apotheosis of numbers threw political influence into the hands of inorganic masses, and established that centralization of authority so hostile to the realization of any liberal and enlightened scheme of government, but which accorded so well with the temper of the grasping and rapacious Puritan. Before this stupendous and irresistible power speedily went down every check, adjustment and contrivance which toiling centuries had laboriously erected as breakwaters against despotic power. It commenced, in Virginia, with the establishment of universal suffrage, and ended with the destruction of the prin-

ciple of the division of power by the creation of a popular judicature.

This all came in the natural sequence of cause and effect. The Puritan was a thinker and speculator, while the Cavalier was an actor, whose synthetical genius looked only to results—often too exigent and momentous to be submitted to the slow elaboration of analysis. The one established an empire of opinion; the other, of institutions; and, in the interpretation of a common charter, and the administration of a general government, the natural antagonisms were too violent to permit the growth of a healthy and vigorous national sentiment. The idealism of the North encountered the realism of the South, and, for a time, recorded its triumphs in all the fields of active and speculative endeavor. It achieved an intellectual supremacy, looking to future political conquest and subjugation; and following the course of Southern empire, from its more ancient seats along the Chesapeake and Potomac, to the fresher fields it had opened under more genial suns, it entrenched itself in the high places of power, and strangled the originality of Southern thought in its cradle. The bench, the bar, the legislative chamber, the press, the pulpit and the seat of learning were equally under its influence and control, and became the potent instrumentalities for crushing out all spontaneous Southern development. The learned professions, the mechanical trades, the industrial callings—all the avenues to wealth, enterprise and preferment—were filled by Northern adventurers, whose term of citizenship was measured by the length of time allotted to the acquisition of independent estates, which, when obtained, were transferred to Northern borders. The effect upon the South of this overwhelming tide of Puritan immigration, was most emasculating and exhaustive. Under such a complete vassalage, the growth of a native thought was impossible; there was not a sufficient amount of vitality in the system of Southern society to assimilate and absorb, or counteract and destroy the hostile influences from without, and atrophy and decay had commenced to feed upon every fibre of the social body. The domestic economy of the South was assailed in the halls of the national Government; and through the avenues of the press and post the power of the enemy was multiplied indefinitely, without any adequate opposing force to counteract it—no native philosophy or literature to reflect the great ideas of Southern civilization, and give them a vitality of their own; no native statesmanship bold enough to confront the power of an omnipotent Government, and advocate the scheme of an independent Southern nationality.

But the subjection of the Cavalier to the intellectual thralldom of the Puritan, in the field of pure speculation, was but the conjoint effect of an immense activity exerted by the former in a different and more practical sphere, and an idolatrous

veneration for the stately fabric of civil wisdom, which the genius of the Norman had conceived and founded. In statesmanship and diplomacy; in material greatness, moral elevation and social refinement; in all the arts and amenities that add grace to thought, polish to manner, dignity to character, while softening the contact of hostile social forces, the States of the South stood alone and pre-eminent; while the noble and disinterested sacrifices they made on the altar of the National Union, so long as it lasted, was the best evidence they could give of their patriotic devotion. Settled by vigorous, banyan offshoots of the grand old Norman stock, and holding in contempt the occupations of commerce and trade, from which the Puritan drew his wealth, the Southern communities were characterized by an attachment to rural pursuits, and made themselves the renowned centres of landed wealth and agricultural power. This fact, together with the absence in their midst of great metropolitan centres, destroying the industrial equilibrium and corrupting the fountain of the public morality, gave them a physical strength, social elevation and political integrity, which exercised a commanding power and influence in the federal administration, so long as its councils were guided by patriotism and its principles and measures were kept in strict subjection to constitutional sanctions.

The five fundamental facts of Southern civilization then, that may be fixed upon as individualizing its genius, characterizing its spirit and embodying its more subtle and ethereal dynamic forces, are: the Norman race, domestic servitude, agricultural occupation, tropical climate and staple production. Taken singly, any one of these elements would of itself individualize a people and establish the conditions of an original civilization. Combined, they form an aggregation of forces—material, social, moral and intellectual—that could find no possible embodiment, short of absolute and unconditional empire. Among the races descended from the great Caucasian stock, whose genius is inscribed on the monuments of four continents, and whose empire is bounded only by the limits of civilization, the Norman is the august head and central representative power. Whether originally from the North or South, or yet further from the remote East, history is undecided; but the dissolution of the empire of Charlemagne found this great people seated in Provence and Lorraine in south France, anterior to their final establishment in Normandy. They gave an institutional character to the civilizations of the Mediterranean nations, and their tongue became the established court language of Europe. Wherever their power extended, feudalism sprung up, and free institutions supplanted ancient despotisms. In England they planted a polity whose majestic and harmonious proportions have challenged universal admiration, and perpetuated a line of sovereigns and statesmen who have

placed and maintained England in the front rank of the nations. In policy and administration, in negotiation and war, they have achieved a lofty pre-eminence, and illustrated the annals of the British empire with names whose glory has become the common heritage of the human race. From Palmerston and Wellington to Chatham, Halifax, Newcastle, Stratford, Marlborough, Bolingbroke, Buckingham and Warwick, the splendid line extends, till lost in the twilight of the mediæval age.

From this same race have sprung the Washingtons, Pendletons, Randolphs, Lees, Calverts, Prestons and Waltons, whose genius gave form and character to the civilizations of the Southern commonwealths, and revived on a new theatre the grand and inspiring traditions and souvenirs of the English Cavalier. And the ascendancy, so long maintained by Southern statesmanship in the former Federal Union, furnishing nine out of fifteen Presidents to the republic, controlling the public policy of the nation in the face of superior numerical opposition, and contributing to the diplomacy of the country its ablest and most eminent negotiators, was due mainly to the fact of the inherent power and native vigor of the Norman blood asserting its supremacy over the weaker social forces with which it was brought in contact. But it is not in the sphere of politics proper that the more prominent and distinguishing characteristics of Southern civilization are to be looked for. There is a deeper and more interior, a subtler and more ethereal life that lies hid from any but the closest scrutiny; and it is precisely this element which proclaims the genius of Southern society to be eminently Norman. Even De Tocqueville, the most observant and philosophic of the Europeans who have written about America, failed to note it. It consists in the fact of the vast superiority of the social over the political life; of the nongoverning over the governing forces. The allurements and attractions of public life have, for more than a half century, failed to call from their coveted retirement and seclusion, a major portion of the ablest and most useful minds of the South. This fact is more particularly true in its application to the more newly settled of the Southern States, where the influx of Northern immigration has been greatest, and has had the effect of transferring political power from the hands of natives to aliens. In Mississippi, with a single exception, no native ever represented his State in the former national Government; and the present eminent Chief Justice and the former able Executive, are the only natives that have received in their respective departments the highest honors in the gift of the State. On the contrary, with but a few, rare exceptions, its destinies have, with a shameful incivism, been committed to the keeping of Northern adventurers, who have shaped its legislation, controlled its politics, and risen to its highest dignities,

both State and Federal, to the almost total exclusion of the children nurtured in its own bosom. And even in the mother States—Maryland, Virginia and Carolina—the lofty "*gaudia certamenis*" has long since ceased to draw from their quiet retreats the noble *athletæ* who, under happier auspices, would proudly aspire to the public honors. All this was but the legitimate result of the Jacobin philosophy of Jefferson, conjoined with the heretical teachings of Storey—the one seeking to enlarge the area of individual liberty, uncontrolled by the wholesome restraint of institutions, and attempting to apply in practice the vicious and unsubstantial theory of an original social contract, founded upon natural right; the other, professing to discover in the principle of centralism and consolidation the true theory of free government, and vesting bare majorities with absolute and uncontrolled power, each giving birth to a political party tending, the one to radicalism and anarchy, the other to a despotism of numbers, and both striving to obtain possession of the Government as the only means of consolidating and perpetuating its power. Political influence thus fell into the hands of politicians by trade, whose unscrupulous arts and practices drove the truer, better and more patriotic class of men into exile, and the true genius of Southern civilization was nowhere less to be seen than in the public administration. Politically ostracised and seemingly powerless, this proscribed and nongoverning element retired from the public theatre, after surrendering the Government into the hands of placemen, and built up a social empire more imposing and august than the political authority itself. It was this power—the great landed and agricultural interest—and not the public functionaries that organized and consummated the Southern revolution; and the hopefulest guaranty and assurance of the future greatness and permanency of the Confederacy, is to be found in the continued ascendancy of this great and conservative element in the public councils of the country.

Not unlike the picture which Guizot, in his "History of the Civilization of Europe," draws of the state of mediæval society, is the character of the civilization of the South—the whole continent parcelled out among great proprietors who, surrounded by their numerous retainers and dependents, bond and free, and exercising a sovereign jurisdiction over their independent and isolated domains, formed within their castellated abodes a society which reflected in miniature the greater social circle of the court; and contented with the power and consideration they enjoyed at home, and looking to no omnipotent Government for favor and preferment, these great vassals, like the barons of Runnymede, were the conservators of the public liberties of Europe against the military power and despotic centralism of the Crown, and the originators of that balance-

wheel in the machinery of Government, which modern political science has approved as the securest check upon the arbitrary tendency of civil power. It was the defence and vindication of this identical principle, as represented in the doctrine of States' rights, and in contradistinction to popular sovereignty and majority power, that drove the Southern States into revolution. It was the Southern representation in the Senate that gave to the former American Government the character of conservatism it possesses; and this conservatism grew out of the character of the men whom the sovereign States nominated to that august office—men belonging chiefly to the agricultural interest, and educated by long years of political experience and contemplation to the high and responsible office of statesmanship.

But the virulence of party spirit and the radical and leveling tendency of national politics had, long before the great Southern leaders were called from their labors, robbed public station of much of its once high and noble dignity, and diverted the thought of the rising statesmanship of the country to other and serener fields of endeavor and contemplation. Around the *Lares* and *Penates* of the domestic altar, amid the tranquil delights of rural occupation, in the bosom of the social circle, and along the quiet walks of professional life, the active and speculative forces of Southern civilization diffused their strength and influence, and found a not unfit and inappropriate expression. The pride of the Norman could not bend before the power of a leveling democratic absolutism; it moved Southern manhood to renounce an inglorious career, retire behind the bulwarks of its noble institutions, and prepare for the coming of that inevitable dismemberment which the political association of two hostile races had from the beginning foreshadowed; and when it came, the genius of the Cavalier rose to the full measure of its greatness, and vindicated that same supremacy in arms which it had so long maintained in civil wisdom and public administration.

A country composed of somewhere near a half million of slaveholders—and quite half that number large landed proprietors—scattered over a boundless and fertile territory, and constituting at once the Doric pillars and Corinthian capitals of the social edifice, is something more than what its exterior phenomena would seem to indicate. It was this deceptive exterior only that DeTocqueville, in his survey of the public institutions of America, saw when, in comparing Kentucky with Ohio, he beheld, in the domestic economy of the latter, the conditions of a greater future than would be realized by the former. In attempting to urge, as a strong argument against the social institutions of the South, that serf labor was less *profitable to the owner* than free, he was at once betraying the shallowness and grossness of his philosophy, and, unwittingly, offering the

most valid argument in their defence. He looked to merely material results, without stopping to consider those higher and nobler elements of a nation's civilization—its moral and intellectual greatness—which alone give empires an historic record, and decree their monuments immortal. Had he seen the dying statesman of Carolina defending with his last breath the constitution of his country; had he beheld the sublime spectacle of eleven sovereign States grasping the sword and confronting the power of a formidable Government; had he caught the lofty language breathed in the inaugural of the first President of the Confederate republic; had he followed, over the plains of Virginia, the conquering columns of the commander of the Potomac, and then turned his eye to survey the political state of the remnant of that once free and noble Government, whose empire had been carved out by the sword of Washington, he had then been prepared to acknowledge the existence of a might, power and majesty in Southern ideas, which no hostile opposition can ever break, and the presence of an aggregation of social elements containing all the conditions of a most exalted national greatness.

When it is remembered how the civilization of Southern Europe had its origin, how the Latin nations rose to empire, how the Norman race maintained its ascendancy—attaching itself to the soil, and founding a great territorial power—the devotion of the southern American States to the pursuits of agriculture, forms not the least important and suggestive fact of their civilization. The genius of a nation is nowhere so strongly expressed as in the character of its industry; and empires are weak or powerful in proportion as they are greater consumers or producers—more commercial or agricultural. But Southern suns and staple production are the indispensable conditions precedent to the attainment of the greatest agricultural prosperity. Russia is agricultural, yet poor and depressed, because of a rigorous climate and a consumptive power far out of proportion to its productive capacity; while France, with only one-half its population and one-tenth its extent of territory, yet, lying under a milder heaven, and enriched by its fruitful vinehills, holds in its hands the European balance of power. Yet, if possessed of the social institutions of Russia, it would exercise a still more controlling influence on the affairs of Europe. But agriculture, in order to be made capable of achieving its grandest results, must rest upon permanent territorial possession, and be delivered from the great social and political evil resulting from the indefinite partibility of landed estates. The agricultural power of France has been gradually declining since the abolition of feudal tenures, and the overthrow of that great landed influence once wielded by such families as that of Montmorency. Since the revolution, the industry of France has been exerted in the direction of commerce

and manufactures, and has resulted in the building up of an immense oppidan influence, hostile to the interests of agriculture. Nor is it merely in its imposing material results that the influence of rural occupation upon a national civilization is to be witnessed. It fosters the growth of the martial spirit, and brings to the support of Government a well-matured and enlightened public sentiment, which gives strength and stability to the national forces, and increases, indefinitely, all the varied resources and capabilities of empire. And conducted, as it is, in the Southern States, by servile labor, under the control and supervision of a superior race, and with all the favoring influences and adaptabilities of soil, climate and production, it furnishes the only secure foundation upon which liberal institutions can permanently rest. It is divested of the repulsive competitive features, attaching to commerce and manufactures, whose effect is to concentrate in large masses and corrupt population; and throws into the scale of law, order and conservative rule, a mass of educated opinion which completely neutralizes the action of the more restless and disorganizing forces, that equally disturb the peace of society and endanger the security of Government.

Combining all these varied elements of social greatness and national power, newly entered upon a career of independent empire, standing isolated and alone among hostile and unsympathizing nationalities, and surrounded by trying and perplexing complications, springing up at every step, and prolonging, but not rendering doubtful, the ultimate issue of a stern and sanguinary conflict; the Southern republic looks serenely through the accumulating difficulties and dangers of the present to an assured final triumph, in a no very distant future, of those grand and imperishable ideas embodied in its noble civilization and now beckoning it on to empire; and with heart resolved and hands prepared to carry to successful end the work begun, sire to son will the legacy transmit, till the Norman race record, in America, what, with strong hand and ten centuries of dominion and power, it has written on the civilization of Europe.

ART. II.—CALHOUN AND WEBSTER.*

John C. Calhoun and Daniel Webster—distinguished names in the history of American statesmanship—their forms have passed from the eye of living men; their voice no longer heard by listening and admiring senators. They live in lasting re-

* 1st. The Works of John C. Calhoun, edited by Richard K. Cralle. 6 vols. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1854.

2d. Works of Daniel Webster, with a Memoir by Edward Everett. 6 vols. Boston. 1853.

3d. Correspondence of Daniel Webster, edited by Fletcher Webster.

membrance, and stand forth on the historic page, monuments of a deep philosophy, and exponents of the antagonism of the policy of the former Government of the United States.

We have the lives of these men, written by devoted admirers of each, and their speeches carefully collated by trusted friends.

These works present a fair and full record of their sentiments and positions, occupied during a long and eventful period. Their names were the most prominent in the civil history of the late United States, from the beginning of the War of 1812 to the period of their deaths. They may be justly considered, not only as representative men of the great issues that divided parties during their public service, but the leading actors upon those principles which, on the one hand, fostering aggression on the part of the North, forced, on the other, the South into remonstrance, and finally to resistance.

Calhoun entered congress in the year 1811; Webster, in 1812. Calhoun the leading statesman of the South, but national and conservative in all his views. Webster, the embodiment of a sectional representative, sought, under the broad panoply of the constitution, to secure with every breath of legislation, some undue and selfish advantage to the North.

From the lustre of their rising sun, it was quickly seen that each would enjoy a reputation of midday splendor, and an eve of unclouded fame, rarely attained among men.

But it is not my purpose to write a biographical sketch of these men; to notice the shining virtues and high moral character, which even the enemies of Calhoun were forced to acknowledge; nor the many moral blotches and deformities which Webster's mighty mind failed to conceal, and his warmest friends deemed it more prudent to forget than to deny.

They were each great publicists and statesmen; but the historic pen is mostly interested in the philosophic bearing of their career, and the influence each had in shaping and directing the actions of those living in the different sections of the Union.

In tracing their public course, will be found many of those antagonistic principles which crept under the folds of the late Union, nursed by a selfishness, and sustained by a spirit of aggression on the part of the North, which opened the eyes of Calhoun first among the statesmen of the South, as to its real condition; which, after argument and remonstrance, seeming but to incite our Northern neighbors to acts of greater violence, has finally resulted in a pure and manful resistance on the part of the South for those rights and privileges, those dear-bought liberties which she can enjoy out of the *Union*; though under the principles of the constitution her fathers left.

Descended from parents of different origin; educated in different and diverse schools; with habits, inclinations and pursuits entirely unlike; with minds of a different order, no two men

had a destiny more differently worked, nor could have pursued paths more divergent. If Webster was reared under an ill-omened fate, to pander to an aggressive international policy, Calhoun was presented under a heavenly providence, to check for a while his sinister and sectional career, and finally to plant broadly and deeply, the philosophy of that school which bore the high commission of rescuing the constitution from a Northern vandalic horde, and replanting the banner of constitutional liberty beneath the more congenial skies of the South.

Webster was a man of close and studious habits, and though no stranger at the shrine of sensual appetites, possessed a high order of genius, which he cultivated with intense labor and assiduity. Educated for the bar, he became not only the first lawyer of his day, but cultivated a severe taste for classic and general literature, which he improved and preserved throughout life; he became an eminent master of style in speaking and writing, which will be long remembered and cherished among the gems of American literature. His taste for poetry, his talent for rhetoric, were also conspicuous; and with an imagination as luxuriant as Burke's, he united the condensation of Pitt; while his most cogent arguments were often decorated with beautiful imagery, and enriched with a drapery of style brilliant and striking: which, illuminating a dark and often repulsive visage, and warming a heart usually cold and callous, burst forth with a burning eloquence as astonishing to the audience as the blazing eruption that warms and melts the frigid atmosphere around the snow-clad craters of the heaving volcano; but when the impulse died away, he subsided to his frigid nature, and recoiled beneath the scowl of a cloud-covered brow, devoted only to self.

With a vision that professed to scan the welfare of the Union, its utmost horizon could not be stretched beyond the hills of his native North.

When desiring no prouder epitaph than "the Defender of the Constitution," and praying, "When my eyes shall be turned to behold for the last time the sun in heaven, may I not see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union; on States dissevered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with civil feuds, or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood." His wide comprehension could not allow the truth to be obscured, that he was lending the herculean powers of his mind to defeat his verbal imprecations, and to stultify the idea with which he closed the splendid oratory of one of his finest speeches: "Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable!"*

His mind and thoughts evidently turned to the exclusive interest of New England, and those States in political and

* Second speech on Foote's Resolutions.

social alliance with her, for whom alone he would defend the constitution and preserve the Union. The truth of this remark will be manifested, after an examination of the political policy pursued by Webster throughout his public career. For it will be shown he advocated no great measure that was not exclusively for the benefit of the North, and uniformly opposed every species of legislation calculated to benefit the South, except, occasionally, common decency forced him to oppose the more flagrant views of the abolitionists.

Calhoun was a man of broad, comprehensive views, with a mind of great power and directness; he approached his subject with the unerring aim and force of a well-directed, well-charged Minnie ball. Well educated, studious and thoughtful, but not so much inclined to various studies as Webster, he was scarcely a lawyer in the professional expression of the term, though thoroughly versed in the great principles of jurisprudence and international laws. He was acquainted with the classics and with the outlines of the physical sciences, and better read in history and literature than a large class of public men; yet he was not devoted to classical, scientific or literary pursuits. With no brilliancy, he entirely neglected the cultivation of the imagination, and discarded the flowers of rhetoric; yet he was a statesman and a philosopher of the loftiest and proudest cast, whose mind has shed its fruits upon American policy. He was a man of more will than passion; he viewed great questions of State with calm philosophy and great power. He was eminently a metaphysician, but clear of all its snares and obscurities. He sought truth, and perceived it with the directness and clearness of a sunbeam. He studied style by no model; he seized upon the rich ore of thought, and in the crucible of his own mind disincumbered the pure metal of all dross. He had the succinctness of Tacitus, the point and pith of Junius, the rich thought of Burke, and all his forecast, without the magnificent imagery of the great philosophic statesman of England. He had all the energy of the younger Pitt, and sustained the constitution with a loyalty that surpassed even his devotion to the ministry and the Crown, which rocked beneath the thunderbolts of Chatham, while the close, compact, and irresistible power of analysis and argument surpasses the best exertions of Pitt.

Calhoun was a statesman in the highest sense of the term; his mind was imbued with the richest fruits of political philosophy—history; government as a science; all of his studies, all of his acquirements, were ancillary to this great purpose. History scarcely affords an example of a mind so acute and quick, evolving thought with such rapidity, and yet so comprehensive of every idea connected with his subject; a logic so close as to be impenetrable to the keenest blade, and equally irresistible to the heaviest artillery of the enemy. He dis-

carded eloquence and ornament, though at times his deep convictions wafted him to the highest eloquence of feeling; but he preferred to build his argument, as a skillful engineer would construct a fortress, and when completed, with barbette, and columbiad, and bomb-proof, he rested from his labor and reposed in safety; and, above all, he labored throughout life with a purity of purpose and an unsullied integrity that repulsed the arts of flattery, and descended to the grave unsullied by the breath of slander or suspicion, in either his public or private career.

His views were broad, expansive and national, as long as a Southern statesman could be national. He opposed those measures, as will be shown, which were calculated and designed to be sectional; and though he was considered by some a sectional man, a fair examination of his political course will prove that he opposed the dominant majority because their views tended to sectional advancement, while he, himself, stood a peerless national statesman. With a vision more prophetic than Burke's, as he apprehended the dissolution of the moral, political and social empire of France, Calhoun saw the coming storm in his own country. This he did all that a national statesman or patriot could to avert, by opposing sectional issues. He desired that the constitution might overshadow the nation, as the sunlight and dews of heaven rest equally and alike upon all the land. But when, as a statesman, he saw his efforts fail to produce concord, justice and equality, and as he scanned the political horizon, and with the eye of an aged pilot detected the symptoms of an inevitable storm, he strived to preserve the old ship; but when he saw that it must sink beneath the troubled waters, who can say that he was wrong when he sought to preserve the most valuable part of the cargo—his native South—rich in every element of liberty, and fruitful of a high, a pure and powerful nationality.

In connection with this branch of the subject, it is admissible, with but little digression, to illustrate the grasping sectional passion of the free States, and the entirely opposite feelings and sentiments of the South, by reference to the partition of territory under the old Union; and in doing this I will refer to the period of the establishment of peace in 1783, when the territorial extent of the United States was 807,678 square miles. New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and New England, contained only 169,662, making the proportion of territory in the six slave States about four square miles to one of the free States. With an uncalled for and injudicious liberality, for which not the slightest reason can be adduced, the Southern States, among their earliest acts, commenced by deeds of cession to convey large portions of their territory to the general Government. Virginia, by an act which every one must acknowledge was the most short-sighted ever committed by a

State, and the most effective blow against slavery, ceded to the Confederacy the whole of her territory northwest of the Ohio river, by which Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin were made a free gift to free labor. By this act the relative extent of slave and free territory was reversed, and stood: free territory, 409,220 square miles, to 398,458 square miles of slave territory. The States of South and North Carolina and Georgia conveyed to the Federal Government 142,856 square miles, on condition only that slavery should not be interfered with—requiring the Federal Government simply to withhold its legislative hand. This condition was accepted, and from the cession have been formed the States of Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi. We see with what unbounded liberality the slave States acted toward the free States, in giving up, on the first partition of territory, that preponderance she held, and might have retained to this day. It is painful to contemplate the ingratitude and baseness of that party, made strong in the Federal Government by Southern liberality, turning the power thus bestowed against the hand that nursed and nurtured it.

At a later period, large acquisitions of territory were obtained by the purchase of Louisiana and Florida. In reference to the Florida treaty, a Northern Secretary of State gave up, by parting with Texas, more than the proportion of five to one square miles; but, subsequently, by the reannexation of Texas, under the influence of Calhoun, we reclaimed the lost plead of the States. These were all slave territories when acquired. But observe the liberality of the slave States, and the rapacity of the representatives of the free States in their partition.

Louisiana contained 1,470,120 square miles; Texas, 274,356 square miles; Florida, 59,218 square miles—making in all, 1,470,120 square miles. Florida and Texas were reserved to the slave States, making 333,624 square miles; and by the Missouri compromise, a portion of Louisiana, amounting to 158,896 square miles, was reserved to the South. Total in favor of the South, 492,520. The remainder, 977,600 square miles, nearly in proportion of two to one, were accorded to the rapacious appetite of the Government of the United States in its sectional legislation for freesoilism.

Since that division, to say nothing of the Wilmot proviso clause in the Oregon bill, the only territory acquired was under the treaty of peace with Mexico, containing 665,486 square miles—all of which, by an arbitrary, unjust and tyrannical legislation, forced upon the South by a sectional majority, was converted into free territory, by which the North obtained the rich State of California, containing 188,981 square miles; Utah 220,196—making 409,177 square miles, which the Northern States acquired from the war with Mexico, to which Southern valor and Southern treasure contributed the principal portion of the means in money and blood. New Mexico remained,

containing 256,309 square miles—whether valuable or not, remains to be seen. Yet, in the legislation which ensued, the North, by a sectional majority, forced it under the dominion of freesoilism, though by just principles of jurisprudence, municipal and national, it was slave territory.

Calhoun and Webster were actors in the great political scenes by which this inequality, this sectional legislation, was forced upon the South—the former resisting it, the latter sustaining it, more as an employed and professional advocate than as a lofty and national statesman. In this paper it will not be my purpose to depreciate the learning and ability of Webster, for rarely in the history of a single individual has been found a combination of such qualities of intellect in unison with more varied learning. With the elegant and polished oratorical power and accomplishments of Cicero, he possessed more general learning, and, like the great Bacon, appeared at home in every realm of thought and science; but, unlike Bacon, his mighty powers were in reality more misapplied, and more grossly prostituted.

From an early period in the civil history of the late Union, there existed a party, sectional and aggressive, using every means to acquire a controlling influence in the Government, in defiance of every principle of justice and equality, and tending to the establishment of a great central power in the general Government, to the destruction of all constitutional guarantees, and the suppression of every vestige of the rights of the States. Of this party Daniel Webster was the great leader, and the embodiment of its intellectual power.

The South, with almost entire unanimity, opposed this doctrine as tending to produce a consolidated Government, placing its control under a sectional majority, and extinguishing the rights and authority of the States. This school of politics may justly claim Calhoun, though surrounded by a constellation of lights, as the brightest of them all, and the great statesman who led the ranks of statesmen in advocacy of the only doctrine that could give a fair construction and equitable administration of the constitution; in truth, the only basis upon which the Union could have been preserved or the equality of the States maintained.

With a view of illustrating these questions, and others connected with the administration of the Government, their operation and effect, I have taken the political lives of Calhoun and Webster as the representative men in the great contest of the North for supremacy in the Government, and the South for the constitution and the Union, as long as the constitution and Union could stand together; and when they could no longer stand in fraternization, then to show that the South was compelled to withdraw from the Union, in order to sustain the constitution, to ensure freedom from oppression on the part of

a sectional majority, and to maintain the true principles of liberty at home.

From the beginning of the political life of these statesmen, a wide and divergent career opened before them. The country was involved in the second war with Great Britain, a contest in which the South, fighting for national honor, while the interest of the North were more directly involved, yet bore the heaviest portion of the expenses and furnished the largest part of the arm. It was a war chiefly involving the commercial interest of the nation, and the North being the only section ultimately to be chiefly benefited.

Calhoun had preceded Webster in the House of Representatives, with the fire of youth and the energy of his full developed intellect. Urged on by every principle of patriotism, he stood side by side with the gallant and the gifted Clay, in upholding the banner of the nation. As chairman of the committee on foreign relations, he introduced a report, high-toned, able and patriotic, urging congress to declare war. In the language of the report, the period had arrived—

“When the United States must support their character and station among the nations of the earth, or submit to the most shameful degradations.”

In the House, war was declared by a vote of seventy-eight to forty-five—a large number of the minority or antiwar party being from the North—Webster not yet a member. With but few exceptions, the South sustained the war; the North, more especially New England, opposed it with the utmost violence. In 1814, upon a bill for the encouragement of enlistments, when Webster acknowledged in debate—

“It is too true that the frontier is invaded; that the war, with all its horrors, ordinary and extraordinary, is brought within our own territories; and that the inhabitants near the country of the enemy are compelled to fly, lighted by the fires of their own houses, or stay and meet the foe unprotected by any adequate aid of Government.”

Those who are disposed to view Webster as a genuine patriot, will be astonished to know that these remarks were made in a strong and violent effort in the House of Representatives against an increase in the army, when American citizens *were* “unprotected by any adequate aid of Government.” It is true he placed his opposition to the war upon the pretence that the Government designed an invasion of Canada, but this was a miserable subterfuge, unworthy of the intellect of Webster. Let Canada be invaded, it was a military effort to cripple the enemy; whether founded on a correct judgment or not, it did not become a legislator to oppose a vigorous prosecution of the war, when the inhabitants were flying, “lighted by the fires of their own houses,” because he opposed the military operations of the army.

Webster opposed the war because New England opposed it.

She thought it injurious to her shipping interest, for which she would have sunk the flag of the nation, rather than suffer a temporary inconvenience, from which she afterward amassed her wealth and power. It was a war commenced for the protection of the maritime interest of the nation. No people were more interested in commercial pursuits than the North. It was a narrow and contracted policy which induced this portion of the Union to oppose the war; they would with parsimonious hand clutch the passing dollar, rather than support a cause which, in requiring a large expenditure it is true, would yet make a return of incalculable wealth. Webster, and those who followed in the wake of his mighty mind, exhibited but little statesmanship in using every means to embarrass the Government during this period of national trial and distress. The North cannot escape the public condemnation which impartial history has recorded against it, when the records of congress and the speeches of its leading statesmen were freighted with complaints and remonstrances against the war. Massachusetts exhibited in 1813 her loyalty to the Union, her devotion to the national flag, by defending the course of Great Britain, and charging the party in power with a blind and reckless partiality, and even subserviency, to France. New York and other Northern States exhibited an equal want of fervor and patriotic zeal in behalf of the nation struggling for commercial independence.*

This was the development of the only principle of loyalty to the Government of the United States by Northern statesmen and citizens. They would uphold the Government for sectional purposes; they would sustain its flag when the breeze that bore its folds wafted wealth to their ports; and throughout their history it will be found that the statesmen of their section, as well as their people, have been ready to oppose, not majorities and administrations, but the Government itself, when their interests were at stake, and to use the power of the Government whenever their section could profit thereby, though it be to the direct injury of the sister States.

The want of fidelity on the part of Massachusetts to the constitution and the Union has gone into history, and there let it stand, an eternal blot upon her escutcheon. As early as the year 1809, John Quincy Adams, the representative of a popular and traitorous feeling rankling in the breasts of Massachusetts men, had, in an interview with the President, in which Wm. B. Giles, Wilson C. Nicholas and Robinson, a senator from Vermont, stated "that a continuance of the embargo much longer would certainly be met by forcible resistance; supported by the legislature, and probably by the judiciary of the State.

* Hildreth, Tucker and Ingersol; Bradford's Fed. Gov.; Cocke's Con. Hist. of U. S.

That if force should be resorted to by the Government to quell that resistance, it would produce civil war; and in that event, he had no doubt the leaders of the party would secure the co-operation of Great Britain." Stating farther that their object was and had been for several years a dissolution of the Union, and the establishment of a separate Confederacy; and that he knew in the event of a civil war, the aid of Great Britain would be resorted to.* This was the germ of the celebrated Essex junto plot, which DeWitt Clinton exposed in the New York Senate, and accords, in atrocity, with the determination of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont and New Hampshire to withhold men and money from that war which the South was waging for their own commercial emancipation. The author just quoted, a true New Englander, but not enough of a Puritan to conceal the truth, speaking of the opposition to the war made by the Northern members in congress in the year 1814, says—

"While the tempest of debate was raging in congress, startling echoes came from New England—a war member of the House of Representatives at Washington, having proposed to instruct the Attorney General of the United States to prosecute Governor Chittenden on account of his late proclamation, recalling the Vermont militia. Otis laid on the table of the Massachusetts Senate, a resolve expressive of the duty and readiness of Massachusetts to aid, with her whole power, the Governor of Vermont and the people of that or any other State in support of constitutional rights, by whomsoever infringed."

This disloyal feeling pervaded the legislature of Massachusetts and inflamed the passions of New England, as their lurid zeal burst forth in "blue lights" planted along the shore to assist the enemy against the army of the Union, and to overthrow the Government that was spending its treasure and pouring out the blood of its citizens for their benefit and protection.

The North being a ship-owning and commercial people, it was natural that the first shocks of the war should be felt in that quarter; but it was evident they would be the ultimate gainers upon its successful termination. With what composure then, can impartial history, can justice and honor, look upon them when they endeavor not only to escape the responsibility, but from party and sectional prejudice would fain destroy the temple that sheltered them; leaving their allies of the South to battle against the storm of war, while they would ignominiously escape to the enemy, and turn their guns against their own Government and country.

But, true to their instincts, the Northern people have been constantly fostering a sectional policy; and whenever the opportunity offered, forcing upon the country those measures which, redounding to their exclusive interests, were palpably injurious to the interest of the South.

* Hildreth, 2d series, vol. iii, p. 118.

The war terminated, peace and tranquility smiled upon the land. But a heavy debt had been contracted, and the financial affairs of the Government demanded immediate attention.

In addition to direct taxes by the general Government, which were odious and oppressive, congress determined to raise the duty on imported goods. Here a contest ensued between the North and the South, in which Calhoun and Webster bore the most distinguished part—the former discarding sectional predilections in behalf of the interest of the nation and the credit of the Government; the latter adhering with unyielding obstinacy to a contracted and selfish view of great questions of national policy, then inviting the co-operation of statesmen from every quarter of the country.

Let us compare the course of these two statesmen upon the policy of the nation after the war. The most important feature of legislation that engaged the attention of congress was the adjustment of duties on imported goods, with a view of liquidating the debts of the Government. Calhoun and Webster have been accused of inconsistency in their course upon the tariff policy; of the iniquity about to be written in reference to it, I will endeavor to deal out even-handed justice to each, and treat it with that impartial discrimination the subject historically demands, not only of the characters under consideration, but as to the national bearing of the question itself. The philosophic policy of the statesman, whether temporary or designed to be continuous, can only be truly understood and appreciated by accurately studying the condition of the country at the time. Immediately after the war, the crippled foreign and domestic commerce of the country sprang into an active and vigorous life; in consequence of the interruption to our foreign commerce and the supplies of fabrics formerly obtained from abroad, encouragement had been given to the manufacture of the same articles at home, especially in New England, which branch of industry it was expected would add greatly to the wealth of the country. The spinning and the staple produce of the country, which had so long remained on hand under the overpowering strength of the British navy, now relieved from all restraint, poured forth in a stream of unexampled copiousness. As the value of the raw products was raised abroad in the same degree that it was depressed at home, their prices rapidly rose in the domestic market, and their holders, whether the original producers or the merchants who had purchased them, were proportionally enriched. Cotton which had glutted the market at ten cents, now readily commanded more than twenty. Tobacco rose from two dollars the hundred weight to twenty, and even twenty-five dollars. Land and labor took a correspondent rise, and the country seemed to leap from poverty and privation to affluence and luxury. Every class caught the spirit of expenditure. Gold watches were substituted for

silver ones, silk fabrics for cotton, madeira and champagne for whiskey, and all articles of furniture were displaced for those of greater elegance and cost.

In the middle of this pactolian stream, flowing through the land, there was this impediment to New England; the ready supply of fabrics, cheaper and better than those made at home, operated severely on the domestic manufactures. The report of Secretary Dallas, of the treasury department, showed a national debt on the thirtieth of September, of one hundred and nineteen millions six hundred and thirty-five thousand five hundred and fifty-eight dollars. The current expenses of the Government were estimated at upward of forty-two millions, and the receipts at nearly forty-nine millions. A tariff for revenue, as a means of paying the national debt and defraying the current expenses of the Government, was demanded. In 1816 a tariff bill somewhat protective to domestic fabrics, was introduced into congress. It was reported by Lowndes, of South Carolina, and supported by Calhoun with great ability. The duty was fixed at twenty-five per cent. on both woolens and cottons, to be reduced after three years to twenty per cent. This bill Daniel Webster opposed with all his intellectual powers.

New England had suffered temporarily in her manufacturing interest. Webster's statesmanship had not enabled him to see that his section would ever become manufacturing. We are unable to find any report of his speech on the tariff of 1816. Everett, in his voluminous edition of Webster's works, has omitted it, and even Benton's ponderous tomes of congressional debates, yet incomplete, in sixteen volumes, has failed to notice it; but we have access to his great speech of the first and second of April, 1824, from which the reader can have an opportunity of drawing a few deductions.

As it has been stated Calhoun supported the revenue bill of 1816, our effort shall be to place him fairly before the country on this subject; for his speech, we humbly think, has been used as the medium of great injustice to the distinguished senator and statesman.

He was the friend and advocate at that day, of such protection as a certain class of manufactures needed; such as would afford protection to the agriculturist, and at the same time foster the manufacturing interest of the country. Among which may be mentioned wool and cotton. He said: "The debate heretofore on this subject has been on the degree of protection which ought to be afforded to our cotton and woolen manufactures, all professing to be friendly to those infant establishments, and to be willing to extend to them adequate encouragement." He was not opposed to the introduction of manufactures. "He firmly believed that the country is prepared, even to maturity, for the introduction of manufactures.

We have abundance of resources, and things naturally tend at this moment in that direction." His views were expansive, and entirely national. Speaking of the protection which would be given to agriculture, he contended that it gave an interest strictly American. It was calculated to bind together more closely our widely-spread republic. "He regarded the fact that it would make the parts adhere more closely; that it would form a new and more powerful cement for outweighing any political objections which might be urged against the system." He saw at that early day a disposition on the part of the North to sectional legislation. Any one who will take the trouble to examine the amendments offered and votes cast, in reference to the tariff bill of 1816, will find that wherever discrimination in manufactured articles could be made against agriculture, that the North invariably did it; and as if catching the spirit of prophecy, Calhoun forcibly said, speaking of *disunion*, "this single word comprehended almost the sum of our political dangers, and against it we ought to be perpetually guarded."*

Did he not discover at that time a selfish and sectional spirit of legislation, which he feared would result in a *danger* perpetually to be guarded against? If any are doubtful, even upon the tariff question, let them refer to New England's leader, Daniel Webster, in the great speech he made, eight years later, on the tariff, when it was remodelled in 1824. And upon this question I will undertake to shew that Webster has not only been inconsistent, but sectional and unpatriotic throughout; and it is this sectional feeling to which he daily pandered, that may be attributed, in a large degree, the ultimate downfall of the Union. Let us, in illustrating this point, examine some of the prominent features of his speech delivered on the first and second of April, 1824.

Webster never opposed the tariff on constitutional grounds. We find that Everett, in explanation of Webster's course at this time, perhaps unconsciously, notwithstanding his adroitness, touched the true chord that vibrated to the motive of the Northern statesman. "In the Northern States," says Everett, "considerable advances had been made in manufacturing industry, in different places, especially at Waltham, Mass., but the great manufacturing interest had not yet grown up. The strength of this interest, as yet, lay mainly in Pennsylvania; navigation and foreign trade were the leading pursuits of the North, and these interests, it was feared, would suffer from the attempt to build up manufactures by a protective tariff."†

"Again," says Everett, speaking of Webster's opposition to this bill, "he opposed the bill on grounds of expediency, drawn

* Benton's Abr. Debates, vol. v, p. 643.

† Memoir of Webster by Edward Everett, p. 43.

from the condition of the country at the time, and from the unfriendly bearing of some of its provisions on the navigating interest. He was the representative of the principal commercial city of New England. The great majority of his constituents were opposed to the bill; one member only from Massachusetts voted in its favor."* Here is a distinct admission of the sectional motives praying upon Webster's mind, and directing Northern legislation.

If additional testimony is required to convince the reader that I have formed no unjust opinion of Webster's course, I will make another citation from his Northern biographer. Remarking that, in the brief period of four years, Massachusetts had largely embarked in the manufacturing business. Capital was invested, labor employed, and enormous profits drawn therefrom. In 1828, the subject of protection to domestic manufactures was brought before congress. Webster was then a senator from Massachusetts. The same man who had *opposed protection in 1824*, made the leading speech in 1828 *in behalf of the highest protection*. Where were his free trade notions, his predilections in favor of commerce and navigation, and a due regard to all the interest of the nation—manufactures, commerce and agriculture? Alas! were they smothered beneath the woolen fabrics of New England? In 1824 he thought "freedom of trade to be the general principle, and restriction the exception." In 1828 he changes from front to rear, and thinks restriction the general principle, and freedom of trade the exception. In 1824 he said: "I think it is clear that, if we now embrace the system of prohibitions and restrictions, we shall show an affection for what others have discarded, and be attempting to ornament ourselves with cast-off apparel." In 1828, if he did ornament himself with cast-off apparel, we imagine the testimony is not extinct as to the domestic cloths, the flannels and blankets, that warmed him during the chilling days of a New England or Washington winter. But let Mr. Everett himself give the reason. We can understand the motive. Speaking of the tariff bill of 1828, he says: "Mr. Webster addressed the Senate while the bill was before that body, opposing the objectionable features to which we have alluded. Believing, however, that the great article of woollens required protection given it by the bill, and regarding the *general system of protection as the established policy of the country and of the Government*, and feeling that the capital which had been invited into manufactures by former acts of legislation *was now entitled* to be sustained against the glut of foreign markets, fraudulent invoices, and the competition of foreign labor working at starvation wages, he gave his vote for the bill, and has ever since supported the policy of moderation! protection."†

* *Ib.*, 78.

† *Memoir of Webster*, by Everett, p. 85.

Without doubt or question, Mr. Everett, all parties will adopt your explanation of Webster's course on the tariff question. He changed his views because New England had changed hers, and if her interest was inimical to the combined and general interest of the nation, Webster was no longer a national statesman; but, like his constituents, he could not survey the nation, or care for any interest beyond his section.

This tariff bill, apart from its unjust discrimination against the South, apart from its being iniquitously high and oppressive, was, as it was truly styled by a senator from Maryland, "a bill of abominations." Its history exhibits a sectional combination, on the part of politicians, discarding high statesmanship for intrigue and corruption. It was commenced by the manufacturers for the benefit of the woolen interest, but it required help from other interests, which were brought in for mutual protection. The West was subordinated, and bought up by baits: such as protection to lead in Missouri and Illinois, and hemp in Kentucky. In admitting a variety of interest, it pandered to that vicious principle in legislation which will often collect a majority eager for some system of plunder, regardless of the interest of minorities.

It is evident that this tariff bill was the work of the manufacturers and political adventurers, for the purpose of gaining an undue sectional advantage in the legislation of the country. The first manifestation of which was to be made in the coming presidential election between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson. It was, doubtless, this to which Rowan significantly alluded, when he spoke of the tariff as being "perverted by the ambition of political aspirants."

It was a fatal step in legislation, a turning-point in the destiny of the nation. Webster had changed, and many others with him, as he proclaimed from his seat in the Senate that the protective system had become the established policy of the Government. In becoming a political question, it had assumed a sectional aspect exactly in keeping with New England character and purpose, and one from which an incurable disease had sprung. Benton said it was the mother of nullification; but he was as ignorant of the disease as of the true remedy. The mere passage of the tariff bill, though unjust and oppressive, was of comparative insignificance; in a few years, congress might have remodelled its provisions and removed its effects; but there was a deeper and more lasting malady engrafted upon the principles of our national legislation—it was the determination of a sectional majority, by the combination of every floating interest, to wield the power, the influence and the patronage of the Government for sectional advancement. This forced the necessity of disunion, or abject submission on the part of the South; and history will record that the rapa-

cious principles of government exercised by the North, has justified the South in dismembering the Union.

In the progress of this paper, it will be shown that Webster and his followers led on this sectional war; and that the principles Calhoun advocated were the only means of escaping sectional legislation, and thereby preserving the Union as the constitution designed it to be preserved, under a fair, just and equitable administration of every department, with a force bearing equally upon each section, exacting upon none, spreading its benefits alike over all.

The principle of sectional legislation exercised in a republic like that which formed the United States, will create not only a disregard for the interest of minorities, but a tyrannical display of power. The truth of this remark is illustrated by the position occupied by New England statesmen—the leader of whom was Webster—in 1830, in reference to the powers of the general Government. Calhoun being Vice-President, was not a member of the Senate at the time the famous debate occurred between Webster and Hayne, on the subject of State rights and the powers of the Federal Government. The history of the “great debate,” as it has been called, on Foote’s resolution, has often been described and written. The English and American reader are perfectly familiar with its details. Webster stood on the floor of the Senate the great champion of New England—the great advocate of the power of the Government to sustain its acquired sectional dominion. Hayne was the representative of the South—the advocate of the constitution, and of equal and just rights in its administration as an instrument and a chart of Government. Unusual powers of debate and a most extraordinary exhibition of talent, was displayed by each of the distinguished senators most prominent on this occasion. Northern writers have exhausted the powers of encomium on their “Godlike Daniel,” as he has been impiously styled; but a fair and candid criticism in according great powers to Webster, displayed on this occasion with more than wonted force and learning, cannot withhold the palm of a brilliant success to the gallant and the gifted Hayne. In bold and impassioned oratory, he bore aloft the banner waving in proud and triumphant success. In the close fight of argument, his was the artillery that shattered and swept from the field every gun, even in the battery of Daniel Webster. But while the history of this great parliamentary fight has been recorded, the American people have failed to view the contest in its true, philosophic bearing. It was the most important era in the constitutional history of the late Government, viewed in reference to the contestants and the stake at issue. Webster and Hayne were mere actors in the opening scene of a great drama. The contestants were two sections of a mighty republic—the North aiming to subvert the theory and the power of the Government to the main-

tenance of a sectional supremacy in all the advantages resulting from a combination of interest, which would give it control over the legislation of the country; the South seeking to maintain its just and equal rights, by maintaining the constitution, by exacting from the majority the recognition of those principles which would protect the minority. Webster could not deny that the South had suffered by congressional legislation, but with sophistical art and cunning he contended for the constitutional right of the Government to maintain its laws and defend its dignity, aye, its existence, from assaults which might be deadly. He belonged to that class of politicians which would sustain the Government because it was in a majority. New England had that majority, and would mould the features of legislation to suit its own interest. The majority not only construes the constitution as it wishes, but, like the grasping monarch of France, it vainly proclaims itself "the State." Would Webster, would New England, advocate the irresistible power of the Government and the right to exercise it, if unfortunately in a minority, and its interest suffering? Let New England history in the war of 1812 answer.

Webster constantly vaunted his love of the constitution and the Union, yet he did more as a partisan leader to undermine the one and destroy the other, than any public man of his day; while Calhoun, and his school of politicians, advocated that system of political philosophy adapted to the constitution, which would alone have maintained the Union. Look to the tendency of the New England political school as led on and actuated by Webster. In the debate with Hayne, Webster acknowledged the right of revolution on the part of the State when oppressed, yet he contended for the supremacy of the laws of the general Government and the right of enforcement. Was there a doctrine ever proclaimed in the United States more calculated to drive the States to revolution on the one hand, and to urge on the other, the general Government to inaugurate a civil war, under the foolish and tyrannical slang of the day, "the enforcement of the laws?"

Webster was aware of the inevitable tendency of his position, for he placed the relief of the States, in extricating themselves from the jaws of federal legislation, only in the right of revolution. And such resistance, he said, was "not only acknowledged to be just in America, but in England, also. Blackstone admits as much, in the theory and practice, too, of the English constitution."*

It is certainly a strange code of political ethics to admit the justice of a revolution on the part of the States, and to claim the right on the part of the general Government to enforce

*Second speech on Foote's Resolution, Webster's works, vol. iii, p. 320. Fifth edition. Little, Brown & Co. 1853.

the law against them—a paradoxical blunder and absurdity from which George III and his weak-headed ministry escaped, in forcing revolution upon the colonies; for they claimed the right to tax America, and subdue the colonies to obedience. New England is now carrying out the matured doctrine of Webster, in the person and ministry of Lincoln, and the remnant of a national congress that is sufficiently mean and poor to do him reverence. And if the sage of Marshfield had lived through the year 1861, his cold and unflinching eye might have surveyed, after the carnage of the battle-field, the full result of that lifelong devotion to the constitution and the Union, which he defended with a false philosophy and a perverted heart, for he had too much mental forecast not to perceive in the not distant future, that his views of defending the constitution would ultimately overthrow it, and sink the Union in the vortex of a “just” revolution. I cannot stultify the great mind of Webster so far as to accord him the slightest convictions of the truth of his doctrine; but, rather than relinquish what he supposed would be the advantage resulting to his section from a numerical majority, he would destroy the only safetyvalve to the constitution—the rights of the States—and build up an immense federal engine, which, in the hands of a majority, would crush out every interest not subservient to that sectional power which controlled the Government.

Webster embraced, as the fundamental theory of government, the once suppressed doctrine of the old federal school; and labored during life to revive their most fatal error, that the Government being created by the people, a majority must control the legislation of the country in defiance of the voice of the States—destroying thereby the influence of the great conservative branch of the Government: the Senate, which was the direct exponent and representative of the States, so adjusted as to give an equal power and influence to the smallest and to the largest States.

But this theory will be examined hereafter. It is proposed now to continue the historic examination still farther, in reference to that constant tendency to sectional legislation which, throwing the power of the Government entirely in the hands of a majority, utterly overthrew every check and balance of the constitution, and by a combination of sectional influences forced upon the minority a severance of the Union, and brought about that inevitable revolution which a ruthless majority, like unprincipled tyranný in monarchical Governments have so often created, and which refuses to be suppressed except in blood and carnage, and oftentimes the destruction of the Government itself. The systematic leader of this party, to the day of his death, was Daniel Webster; the instruments in his hands, the guiled, duped and blinded people of New England and the North, who, betrayed by their selfish and grasping cupidity,

were willingly urged on in the flattering though false career which, if opening the paths of temporary gain, have, at last, terminated in political and financial destruction.

In addition to the selfish and exclusive policy of a protective tariff which they fastened upon the country, making the agricultural industry of the South tributary to their enormous and exacting profits, may also be mentioned their determination to clutch, through the medium of national legislation, the capital of the commercial community under the influence of a national bank.

The tariff bill of 1828 had scattered broadcast the seed of discord; Hayne, the successful and triumphant opponent of Webster, as far as truth and intellect were involved, had retired from the Senate; Calhoun had resigned the Vice-Presidency of the United States, and appeared on the floor of the Senate a greater man, morally and intellectually, than Webster, and, by the irresistible power of his logic, better calculated to subdue the even gigantic power of the pet representative of Northern political partisanship; by such name it deserves to be called, for a sectionalism which seeks to convert the force of the Government into channels for local emolument, and then to preserve it by mere numerical strength, sinks its every effort far below the dignity of statesmanship or true philosophy. Such seems to have been the mission of Webster, while that of Calhoun was to illumine by the light of his genius the dark cloud which Northern policy would throw around the constitutional legislation of the country, and to resist by the force of virtue and mind, until overwhelmed by numerical strength, the destructive policy which Webster advocated with all his ability of body and all the influence of his intellect.

The true key to Webster's love for the Union may be found in his denouncing the expression of Hayne: "Liberty first and union afterward," as "words of delusion and folly." He preferred "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."* If Webster is entitled to sincerity in thus transposing a true and patriotic sentiment, it proves that he had no regard for constitutional liberty, for it will appear in the progress of this paper that he claimed the right and the power of a majority of the people, which he knew would be always united under sectional and political combinations, to control the legislation of the country in defiance to the opposition of States not allied in interest with the majority. Such being his idea of liberty and union, he would have made the Union subservient to the majority and liberty as understood by it, to be dispensed as its exclusive prerogative, with no other privilege to the minority section but to obey or resort to a just revolution.

In the present policy of the Lincoln administration, the well-

* Conclusion of his second speech on Foote's Resolution.

informed reader in Europe and America, if honest and unprejudiced, will see the full development of that policy which Webster and those of his school engrafted upon the Government; not that Webster was an open and avowed abolitionist, but he, more than any other man of his day, encouraged the strong and aggressive tendencies of the power of the general Government, which planted the dragon's teeth which are now being reaped by his Northern survivors and legitimate political representatives.

"Liberty" failed to preserve the Union; nor could the "Union," under the philosophy of the Webster school, ever preserve *liberty*.

In illustrating the views of Webster and Calhoun, we have abundant and incontrovertible evidence that the unavoidable tendency, if not the purpose, of the former, was to subvert the true constitutional theory of the Government, by establishing in every instance principles which were at war with the rights of the States, and banding together a class of measures which, addressing themselves to the interest of a sectional majority, speaking and acting through the medium of the general Government, classified a majority of the States against the true interest of the minority, and engendered an arbitrary exercise of power, which acknowledged no restraint in its rapid march to despotism; while the latter contended, with a high and lofty patriotism, and with all the force of truth, nurtured and vitalized by the power of genius, the only theory that could maintain the equipoise of the Federal and State Governments—an equipoise absolutely essential to the perpetuity of the Union.

Impartial history will fearlessly assert the truth, too often withheld from Calhoun, and those who belonged to his school of politics, that they were at heart, as they were practically, the best Union men that existed.

To make manifest the truth of this assertion, and to show that Webster and his political followers pursued a systematic plan to overthrow the Government, I will now notice the course they pursued.

Webster and his New England and Northern party were at one time bitter opponents of the administration of Andrew Jackson; but as soon as the proclamation of this iron-willed man was thundered forth, against the principles of the constitution and the rights of the States, Webster stepped forward, not the supporter of the administration, but to sustain this measure. He had no party motives to entice him to the support of Jackson, whom he despised; but he saw at a glance that it contained the germ of those principles which would lead, if suffered to mature, to the consolidation of the Government, and the permanent establishment of those principles and measures which the fostering care of the Government would exercise to the erection of monopolies, under which a geographical and

closely allied sectional interest, under the name of *bank tariff*, and at a later day *distribution*, and at a still later period, *abolition*, would entwine their poisonous grasp around the Government, for the obvious purpose of prostituting the Government to their own sectional interest, in the most aggressive and corrupt spirit. This was the courtesan spirit that wooed Webster, the sturdy puritan statesman, into the support of the Jackson party. Let it not be said he was acting out his federal proclivities, which it is known were strong and decided.

He advanced many steps beyond the proclamation—that famous paper of Andrew Jackson's, so startling to the ears of States' rights men; and though under the flimsy garb of a puling and finiking love for the constitution, which was ever upon his lips, he could not conceal from the watchful eye the sneaking purpose of offering his political influence to crush the constitution in the unholy embrace of sectional power.

We have no speech of Webster upon the proclamation; but, on another occasion, he expressed himself in a long speech, and in full obedience to his New England puritanical, selfish and sectional policy, which he has entitled "*The Constitution not a compact between sovereign States.*" This astute debater, who always measured his every word with the utmost accuracy, and used them to convey his exact meaning with the utmost force, uttered in the compact sentence which designates the title to this speech the idea he wished to carry out: first, that the constitution was not a *compact*; and, secondly, not a compact between *sovereign States*—meaning thereby indirectly to assail the sovereignty of the States, as well as to deny the theory of its being a compact.

The history of this debate is not only interesting, but instructive to all who feel an interest in the maintenance of civil liberty. It represents a most decisive principle in American political philosophy, and is the exponent of that principle which has crushed the Union.

It was delivered in the Senate of the United States on the 16th of February, 1833, in reply to "Calhoun's speech on the bill further to provide for the collection of duties on imports." We wish the reader to understand the true position of Webster, not as a *statesman*, but as a *representative politician*; not only of a *pernicious principle*, but of a *vicious class*. Therefore the attention of the reader is directed to the views asserted by Webster, which, to a great extent, formed the charts of his political course. We will endeavor to present his views with accuracy, for a true, full length portrait will but exhibit Webster's defects and deformities in their most repulsive aspect. This speech was delivered under the following circumstances: On the 21st of January, 1833, Wilkins, the chairman of the judiciary committee of the Senate, introduced a bill for the purpose of enforcing the collection of duties on imported

goods. Wilkins was a Pennsylvania senator, and belonged to the same class of politicians, geographically and politically, with Webster, with whom he united to force the South to obedience to a sectional majority; and as chairman of the judiciary committee, as well as the exponent of a violent and bitter aggressive party, he advocated extreme measures of force, to hold a sovereign State in subjection to the general Government.

Various resolutions were before the Senate arising from the proclamation of Jackson, among which were those of Clayton, of Delaware, strongly sustaining the general Government; and also a series of resolutions offered by Grandy, of Tennessee, embracing similar views. Thus exhibiting the tendency of minor geographical interests to combine with stronger sectional divisions for the purpose of temporary gain, but too often impelled by party considerations to seek an impure alliance with sectional power.

Calhoun, the great statesman of the day, with a full understanding of the mighty issue, introduced into the Senate a series of resolutions, which were the basis of the debate that occurred, for they struck the paralyzing blow to the sectional majority, from which time and numbers only have enabled it to recover, and to seize with vandalic hand every department of the Government.

The resolutions maintained,

1. "That the people of the several States composing these United States are united as parties to a constitutional compact, to which the people of each State acceded *as a separate sovereign community*, each binding itself by its own particular ratification; and that the union, of which the said compact is the bond, is a union between the States ratifying the same.

2. "That the people of the several States, thus united by the constitutional compact, in forming that instrument and in creating a general Government to carry into effect the objects for which they were formed, delegated to that Government for that purpose certain definite powers, to be exercised jointly, reserving at the same time, each State to itself, the residuary mass of powers to be exercised by its own separate Government, and that whenever the general Government assumes the exercise of powers not delegated by the compact, its acts are unauthorized and are of no effect; and that the same Government is not made the final judge of the powers delegated to it, since that would make its discretion and not the constitution the measure of its powers; but that, as in all other cases of compact among sovereign parties, without any common judge, each has an equal right to judge for itself as well of the *infraction as the mode and measure of redress.*"

3. "That the assertion that the people of these United States, taken collectively as individuals, are now or ever have been united on the principle of the social compact, and as such are now formed into one nation or people, or that they have ever been so united in any one stage of their political existence; that the people of the several States composing the Union have not, as members thereof, retained their sovereignty; that the allegiance of their citizens have been transferred to the general Government; that they have parted with the right of punishing treason through their respective State

Governments; and that they have not the right of judging in the last resort as to the extent of the powers reserved, and, of consequence, of those delegated; are not only without foundation in truth, but are contrary to the most certain and plain historical facts and the clearest deductions of reason; and all exercise of power on the general Government, or any of its departments claiming authority from so erroneous assumptions, must of necessity be unconstitutional—must tend inevitably to subvert the sovereignty of the States, to destroy the *federal* character of the Union, and to rear on its ruins a consolidated Government, without constitutional check or limitation, and which must necessarily *terminate in the loss of liberty itself*.”

Against these “theories and opinions,” as Webster styled them, he maintained those *theories and opinions* which, in their rapid development, overthrew the constitution and subverted the Government.

1. “That the constitution of the United States is not a league, confederacy or compact between the people of the several States in their sovereign capacities, but a Government proper, founded on the adoption of the people, and creating direct relations between itself and individuals.”

2. “That no State authority has power to dissolve these relations; *that nothing can dissolve them but revolution*; and that, consequently, there can be no such thing as *secession without revolution*.”

3. “That there is a supreme law, consisting of the constitution of the United States and acts of congress passed in pursuance of it, and treaties; and that in cases not capable of assuming the character of a suit in law or equity, congress must judge of and finally interpret this supreme law so often as it has occasion to pass acts of legislation; and in cases capable of assuming and actually assuming the character of a suit, the Supreme court of the United States is the final interpreter.”

4. “That an attempt by a State to abrogate, annul or nullify an act of congress, or to arrest its operation within her limits on the ground that, in her opinion, such law is unconstitutional, is a direct usurpation on the just powers of the general Government and on the equal rights of other States—a plain violation of the constitution, and a proceeding *essentially revolutionary in its character and tendency*.”

Webster contended, in a lengthy and laborious speech, to prove the truth of the above propositions. Their truth or falsity involved not only the health, but, we are prepared to admit, the longevity of the republic; and is in implicit obedience to the acts and opinions of the Lincoln Government. The constitution is not a league, confederacy or compact, but a Government proper; then the conclusion that every State is bound to obey the laws of this “Government proper,” for nothing can dissolve the relations existing between the States but revolution—that is, the States have the right to dissolve by revolution, but the existing Government must use the sword to suppress that right. It cannot be denied that the statesman of the North was attempting a policy which would rapidly destroy the State and Federal Governments, and the historian asks no other proof than the present exercise of federal power in the hands of the Lincolnites—the full and legal representatives of that class of politicians of which Webster was for many years the sectional and representative head. Admitting the danger-

ous tendency of the New England school of politics, it is readily perceived that, relying upon their numerical and sectional majority—a majority brought about by a supposed affinity with the Western States—the New England politicians and press-gang editors were willing, and anxious, to risk the existence of the Government on the effort to sustain the power they possessed; and they had but a short transition from the despotism of a majority to the despotism of the sword.

We avoid a statement or review of the arguments of Calhoun on this occasion; they are not only familiarized to the public, but their truth and practical ability has been proved beyond dispute or cavil.

We can now clearly see that there was a regular and a systematic purpose and plan, through the influence of the general Government, to destroy the principles on which it was constructed, and a brief allusion to legislative and executive encroachments will demonstrate our position.

It was a natural sequence that executive patronage and Governmental influence should progress hand in hand, and with an equal grade. The same majority that elected a President was the constituents of a majority of the House of Representatives; and the same influence manifested in State elections was soon to exhibit the same corruption in the Senate of the United States.

In reference to the encroachment of executive patronage, the relations that Calhoun bore to the subject, his efforts and his arguments will alike illustrate the history of the statesman and the wisdom of his policy.

On the 9th of February, 1835, Calhoun, the chairman of a select committee appointed to inquire into the extent of the executive patronage, made a full and accurate report; which not only defied opposition, though it met with but little, it illustrated one of the dangerous avenues by which corruption sought to fatten on the resources of the Government.

Calhoun introduced his reports on the 9th of February, and on the 13th of the same month, 1835, he made one of his masterly speeches.

That corruption was seizing upon high places, was a fact not to be denied; the Government expenditures in eight years, from 1825 to 1833, had risen from \$11,490,460 to \$22,713,755, not including payments on account of the public debt, the vast influence arising from the public lands, and the patronage from our Indian relations.

The most philosophic and practical view that could have been taken of this subject presented itself, with all its force and truth, to the mind of Calhoun, in reference to the effects of this great, growing and excessive patronage on our political condition and prospects. Instead of strengthening our political institutions, it had tended to sap their foundations; public morals,

instead of being purified and strengthened, had become degraded, and subserviency to power had occupied the place of a disinterested and noble attachment to principles.

There is no doubt of the clear impressions which existed on the mind of Calhoun, as early as the year 1835, in reference to the corruptions and the downward tendency of the Government. With wisdom and energy he stood forth the great leading conservative statesman of the country, to maintain the constitution and the Government in its integrity, and, if possible, to extend its temporary existence among the nations of the earth. For, he truly said, "the disease is daily becoming more aggravated and dangerous, and if it be permitted to advance for a few years longer with the rapidity with which it has of late, it will soon pass beyond the reach of remedy." The question was not: "how, or where, or with whom the danger originated, but how it is to be arrested; not the cause, but the remedy; not how our institutions and liberty have been endangered, but how they are to be rescued."

But our liberties were endangered, and among the most destructive principles beginning to unfold themselves at this time may be noticed the springing into existence of the abolition societies, and their wicked and malicious introduction of abolition petitions.

Webster adroitly held himself aloof from the abolition societies, *but he never opposed their designs*, or the presentation of their petitions. Webster was in sentiment and principle opposed to slavery; and though not daring to attack it openly or directly, he was satisfied that the rapid development of the white race would undermine it as an institution.

The lives of Webster and Calhoun fully illustrate their representative position, and presents the conflicting interest which existed under the constitution in their most practical bearing. Webster contending for enlarging the powers of the general Government, with the full exercise of its expansive energy; Calhoun, for its restricted and circumscribed constitutional limits. Their positions are fully illustrated by the following reference to the views of Calhoun, enough having been said to show how entirely antipodal Webster was in everything appertaining to the interest of the South; thereby destroying his character and his efforts as a national statesman. In illustrating the views of Calhoun, I will here insert a document of singular force and ability as a political paper; it was of great value before the dissolution of the Union, on account of the practical philosophy it contained; now it belongs to history, and ought to be preserved and remembered. I allude to the following resolutions offered by Calhoun in the Senate of the United States, on the 27th of December, 1837, in respect to the rights of the States and the abolition of slavery:

1. "That in the adoption of the federal constitution, the States adopting the same acted, severally, as free, independent and sovereign States; and

that each for itself, by its own voluntary act, entered into the Union with the view to its increased security against all dangers, *domestic* as well as foreign, and the more perfect and secure enjoyment of its advantages—natural, political and social.”

2. “That in delegating a portion of their powers to be exercised by the Federal Government, the States retained, severally, the exclusive and sole right over their own domestic institutions and police, and are alone responsible for them; and that any intermeddling of any one or more States, or a combination of their citizens, with the domestic institutions and police of the others, on any ground or under any pretext whatever—political, moral or religious—with a view to their alteration or subversion, is an assumption of superiority not warranted by the constitution, insulting to the States interfered with, tending to endanger their domestic peace and tranquility, subversive of the objects for which the constitution was formed, and, by necessary consequence, tending to weaken and destroy the Union itself.”

3. “That this Government was instituted and adopted by the several States of this Union as a common agent, in order to carry into effect the powers which they had delegated by the constitution for their mutual security and prosperity; and that in fulfilment of their high and sacred trust, this Government is bound so to exercise its powers as to give, as far as may be practicable, increased stability and security to the domestic institutions of the States that compose the Union, and that it is the solemn duty of the Government to resist all *attempts by one portion* of the Union to use it as an instrument to attack the domestic institutions of another, or to weaken or destroy such institutions, instead of strengthening and upholding them as it is in duty bound to do.”

4. “That domestic slavery, as it exists in the Southern and Western States of this Union, composes an important part of their domestic institutions, inherited from their ancestors, and existing at the adoption of the constitution, by which it is recognized as constituting an essential element in the distribution of its powers among the States, and that no change of opinion or feeling on the part of the other States of the Union in relation to it can justify them or their citizens in open and systematic attacks thereon, with a view to its overthrow; and that all such attacks are in manifest violation of the mutual and solemn pledge to protect and defend each other, given by the States, respectively, on entering into the constitutional compact which formed the Union; and as such, is a manifest breach of faith and a violation of the most solemn obligations, moral and religious.”

5. “That the intermeddling of any State or States, or their citizens, to abolish slavery in this district, or in any of the territories, on the ground or under the pretext that it is immoral or sinful, or the passage of any act, or measure of congress, with that view, would be a direct and dangerous attack on the institutions of all the slaveholding States.”

6. “That the union of these States rests on an equality of rights and advantages among its members; and that whatever destroys that equality, tends to destroy the Union itself; and that it is the solemn duty of all, and more especially of this body, which represents the States in their corporate capacity, to resist all attempts to discriminate between the States in extending the benefits of the Government to the several portions of the Union, and to refuse to extend to the Southern and Western States any advantage which would tend to strengthen or render them secure, or to increase their limits of population by the annexation of new territory or States, on the assumption, or under the pretext, that the institution of slavery as it exists among them is immoral or sinful, or otherwise obnoxious, would be contrary to that equity of rights and advantages which the constitution was intended

to secure alike to all the members of the Union, and would, in effect, disfranchise the slaveholding States, by withholding from them the advantages while it subjected them to the burdens of Government."

Calhoun advocated these resolutions with great ability in a philosophic and elaborate speech, which so clearly sets forth the character of the Government that it is deemed unnecessary to examine it. History, in a few years, will place the eternal stamp of truth upon them.

At the same time, let it be historically remembered, how Webster stood upon this momentous question—never aiding to check the progress of abolition societies, to stop the flood of incendiary matter brought to the South by the mails, or to suppress the odious petitions that constantly crowded upon congress.

In this negative position, he viewed with composure the stabs inflicted on the constitution; and in advocating the aggressive and encroaching tendency of a sectional majority, he used his talent with activity and energy to plant the seeds of a revolution, which all men might have foreseen, with an accuracy of prediction as certain as the harvest follows the seed time.

Who is to blame? Will not honest history write out in the dark and damning hues they deserve, not only the mere names of the busy and base abolitionist, the incendiary and the vagrant politician, but also connect with them in true fellowship the boasted statesman of the North, who could stand calmly by and see the Union die, amidst so much blood and carnage, rather than forego the temporary advantages resulting from the predominance of a sectional majority. Calhoun has left a far better Union record than Webster, because Calhoun embraced those theories of our Government which would have sustained the equality designed by the constitution, and, consequently, have prolonged the existence of the Union, while Webster and his party at the North embraced the very doctrine that drove the ship of State, with rapidity and violence, against every rock and quicksand and shoal.

Everett and Seward outlived Webster, physically, but their names will be linked in the black list of those who, on the page of history, are known to have prostituted talent, character, patriotism, and all that honorable men hold dear, on the altar of a low and base selfishness, which honor and statesmanship alike despise.

Webster and Calhoun were each cabinet ministers, and distinguished in their position. The statesmanship of each, in their respective stations in the cabinet, can be properly understood by a fair examination of their views.

ART. III.—MANUFACTURE OF WINES IN THE SOUTH.

EXPOSITION OF A PLAN TO OBTAIN THE DISABILITIES OF CLIMATE OPPOSED TO THE
MANUFACTURE OF WINE IN SOUTH CAROLINA, ETC.*

PART I.

The successful cultivation of a crop, in a suitable soil and climate, is a thing of nature; and need not interpose, except to sow and to harvest. Cotton seems to grow in our soil and climate spontaneously, yet cotton cannot be cultivated in many portions of the world, even under the constant care of the most experienced cotton planters. The manufacture of cotton has succeeded best in those climates where it refuses to be produced; hence, the durability and facility of transportation of cotton, give it a value which it would not possess were it instantly perishable, or as heavy as a metal. The manufacture would be confined to the place of production, and the double labor of harvest and manufacture would have to be performed at the same time. Consider the condition of a plantation where the picked cotton of to-day must be converted into yarn or cloth to-morrow, otherwise the year's labor is lost. Such a change in the durability of cotton would destroy it in this Southern country, and limit its cultivation to small tracts upon the borders of healthy populous regions. Aiken would become a cotton region, and the rich lands of the Mississippi would be abandoned. The European and Northern manufactories would cease, and the value of cotton would be above silk. I have presumed this preternatural change in one of the qualities of cotton, to impress the fact that such is the condition of the produce of the vine. The durability of the ripe grape scarcely exceeds a few days; hence, its conversion into wine must be immediate. The produce and manufacture must be simultaneous, and is so done in all vine-growing regions, and can be done in Aiken, so far as labor is concerned. The mashing, pressing and stowing away of the morning's vintage can readily be done in the afternoon, and quiet sleep may refresh the laborer for his next day's work. Such would be a happy condition of things, were it possible, and possible it must be made, or Aiken must abandon the grape culture.

* Resolutions adopted by the Aiken Vine Growing and Horticultural Association, August 22d, 1861:

Resolved, That the thanks of this association are due to Prof. Wm. Hume, of Charleston, for his very able and elaborate essay and series of experiments upon the grape juices and wines of our country; and that we commend it to public attention, as a valuable contribution to science, and an effort to elucidate a subject, obscure in itself, but of vast practical importance to our growing prosperity.

Resolved, That, appreciating the compliment which the author has paid to our society of making it the medium of communication with the public, we request a copy for the press, and that a committee of three be appointed to make the necessary arrangements for its publication.

Committee appointed in accordance with the above resolution: Messrs. H. W. Ravenel, J. H. Cornish and J. C. Wood.

It cannot be unknown to my readers that the wine-making regions of the world are limited, while the geographical distribution of the grape is universal. The first settlers of America found the grape growing luxuriantly everywhere. The early writers on Carolina proclaimed it as naturally adapted to the production of wine, oil and silk. Persons experienced in these productions were alone necessary to develop the natural resources of the country. The Swiss were established at Purysburg, the French at New Bordeaux, and the Huguenot on the French Santee—each with the intention to cultivate the grape, and to manufacture wine. Upward of one hundred years have passed away since the establishment of these wine-producing colonies, and who ever heard of the exportation of a single cask, or the home consumption of a single bottle of potable wine?

M. St. Pierre* published a book of instruction in wine making in London, in the year 1772, for the express use of the Carolina vine growers settled at New Bordeaux, in Carolina, which seems not to have accomplished the design of the author—for the English were as unsuccessful as the French and Swiss. Suffice it to say, that the vine culture was abandoned, and wine making proved a failure. The name of New Bordeaux is not seen on the recent maps of the States, but on the older maps it will be found in Abbeville district, somewhere between Cambridge and the court-house.

The knowledge of so palpable a failure to produce a saleable wine, undertaken by experienced wine makers from the best wine-producing country, is calculated to chill the ardor of the wine-growing association of Aiken, and to induce a fear that one hundred years hence, the names of New Bordeaux and Aiken will only be known as places where the grape was cultivated, and where wine was not made. We have no historical evidence of the cause of failure at New Bordeaux, but have reason to believe that the first disappointment proceeded from the inability of the European grape to adapt itself to our climate. Such has been since proved in our times, and now the cultivated native grapes are alone relied upon in Aiken as the material from which wine may be made. Aiken thus far, excels New Bordeaux. The soil and climate produce the fruit abundantly. The skilful conversion of the grape juice into wine is what remains for the association to effect; and I am sorry to proclaim my belief that it is not so easily done as many have supposed. A weak, acid wine may be abundantly produced at Aiken by the European method of manufacture; but it will be unsaleable for domestic consumption. The manufacturers of

* "Art of planting and cultivating the vine, and making, fining and preserving wines, according to the most approved methods in the most celebrated wine countries in France. By Denis de St. Pierre." 1 Vol., 12mo. London. 1772.

factitious wines will soon discover that it is too acid for their purposes. It will cost more to *repair* it than it is worth, and a better wine may be made without the introduction of sour grape juice; hence, I have reason to believe that the demand for the present class of Aiken wine will be very limited, and the price will not repay the labor of production. Aiken must follow the fate of New Bordeaux if a radical change is not effected in the present system of manufacture, and if we do not succeed in producing a better quality of wine.

Unpleasant as this announcement may be, it is, nevertheless, the result of calm reflection of all the presented conditions. Discouraging as it must appear to the vine growers, it will ultimately lead to a revolution of the whole system, and will involve a simple principle which may be practiced successfully.

To discover error, is the first step to reform. I have discovered a fundamental error in the wine culture in Aiken, which, if reformed, will lead to success; if persisted in, will end in disappointment. There are certain natural laws that must always be regarded, and failure is always the result of the neglect of these laws. These laws have been disregarded among the wine growers of Aiken, and I trust that it will be only necessary to point them out, to convince the association that obedience to law is essential to success.

I have already remarked that the geographical distribution of the vine was universal, while the wine-making regions of the globe were limited. A careless thinker would say, that wherever God has planted the vine, there man was designed to make wine; but such is not the truth. The climate best adapted to the production of the grape is not adapted to the manufacture of wine. A warm climate brings the grape to perfection, but warmth is destructive to the vinous fermentation. Hence, at the temperature that the grape succeeds best, the juice cannot be converted into wine; and in the proper climate for the successful production of wine, the grape will not come to perfection. The production of wine requires both heat and cold, both summer and winter—one to produce grape, the other to produce the wine. Hence, an examination of the wine regions of the world will exhibit a warm summer—about equal in length to the time necessary for maturing the fruit—immediately followed by a moderate winter. A temperature of 60° is well suited to make wine, but will not produce a sweet grape. A temperature of 90° is well adapted to the grape, but will certainly produce a sour wine. The summers of France, Spain, and Portugal are warm enough to bring the grape to perfection, and just long enough to complete the maturity at the commencement of winter; so that the wine maker receives the fruit at the time when the temperature is best adapted to the successful conversion of the juice into wine by the process of the vinous fermentation. He feels no apprehension of produc-

ing a sour wine; and if vinegar is desired, he must adopt a special process to institute the acetic fermentation. A reference to the climate of all wine regions will point out the peculiarities which I have stated. The wine region of Madeira is 2,000 feet above the level of the ocean; thus, elevation compensates for latitude, and the summer and winter are brought together at the period of maturity of the fruit.

From the above observations, we may assume that there is an especial adaptation of climate to the grape culture, which does not exist in all parts of the world; and although the vine may grow in every latitude, wine cannot be made in every place. If we apply this principle to Aiken, we will discover the first germ of distrust, and the explanation of the cause of failure to make a sound wine. The summer is too long for the kinds of grape cultivated. They ripen too soon. August is too warm to effect a sound fermentation. The acetic fermentation will accompany the vinous, by virtue of the high temperature, and a mixture of wine and vinegar will be the result. The smell or chemical examination clearly announces this fact; and although the removal of the acetic acid is possible, it would be better to have prevented its formation.

In proclaiming an evil of such magnitude, it is proper that I should point out a remedy, and induce the members of the association to assist in correcting the error. We have seen that the grape matures too early for the wine-making season. We cannot shorten the season, but we can look about and find a grape that takes longer to come to perfection. We desire a grape that will ripen in October, if wine making be the object. Our forefathers selected the earliest varieties for table use, and we have undertaken to make wine out of table grapes. We are still engaged in producing new varieties by cultivation, and rejoice at the production of a new early variety. Our endeavors should be the reverse; we desire an October variety; and such a variety, cultivated in Aiken, will immediately remove all apprehension of future failure to make a sound wine. Table grapes in Europe are produced throughout the summer, and the earlier the production the better they sell; but no man attempts to make wine in summer out of table grapes. The wine grape must necessarily be a late grape; and if it is not a late grape, it is not adapted to the manufacture of wine. The heat of a French summer is as hostile to the manufacture of wine as the heat of an Aiken summer; and it is useless to expect to do that in Aiken which cannot be done in natural wine countries. Summer is the time for making white wine vinegar in France, and white wine vinegar may be easily and successfully made in Aiken; but a sound wine, according to French methods, can never be made in Aiken during the month of August. The grape or the process must be changed, in order either to bring the maturity of the fruit to cool weather, or to preserve the juice until the

temperature suits the vinous fermentation. Our first endeavor should be to seek out later varieties, and stock the vineyards with them for future use; and until that is accomplished, other expedients may be employed to obviate the disadvantages of climate, and the error of planting a grape which comes to maturity too early for manufacturing purposes. I am not prepared to point out substitutes for the present cultivated grapes of Aiken; it is sufficient to direct attention to an error already committed; and many varieties which have been discovered and rejected for the virtue which I recommend, should be restored to popularity and actual utility. That such neglected varieties do exist, is manifest from the following extract of a letter from the Hon. J. H. Hammond, dated September 13th, 1860, and we may also infer that he has reason to value a later grape: "I send you a few bunches of wild grapes. The two larger grapes I got from a distance; the smaller grows in my field here, where it has been undisturbed from its first appearance, though some fifteen or more crops have been planted and cultivated just around and above its long roots. The leaves of these vines have disappeared for two or more weeks, but the grapes would hang on until Christmas if permitted. These are to me very interesting grapes; and if your analysis is at all favorable, I propose to cultivate them extensively. For mere taste I know no wild grape, *really wild* grape, to compare with them, save the Catawba, and they have no foxy flavor." For what object this extensive cultivation is designed, I am not told; but I trust that the observation and sagacity of the writer has discovered what I have endeavored to enforce above, viz: that a later grape is better adapted to wine making. An examination of these wild grapes, made on the 17th of September, places two of them on a par with the Catawba, Warren and Isabella, examined on the 4th of August, as regards size and maturity, and the third equalled them in maturity, as examined on the 26th of August. The process of maturity was thus considerably in arrears with the cultivated grapes, but two months of time remained to complete the process; and the ability to remain on the vine until required for use, is an advantage greatly to be desired. The greenest of the Redcliffe grapes (Hammond's), on the 17th of September, was riper than the New York Isabella of the 27th—being in sweetness as 1047 to 1038, and in acidity as 3.13 to 3.63; hence, the neglected grape of the Redcliffe plantation was a better fruit than the renowned Isabella, from New York, which now sells at thirty seven and a half cents per pound in the City of Charleston.

I have given these suggestions of a later maturing grape to correspond with the practice of other wine-growing countries, and to meet a difficulty connected with the produce of the vine at Aiken. We are in the condition of a cotton planter who can neither preserve, transport nor manufacture his pro-

duce. For the grapes, after the 20th August, "vanish rapidly" from the vines from various causes. If the fruit is gathered, it will neither dry nor remain sound; and if the produce is pressed and fermented, an unpotable liquor may be expected. Thus, it is manifest that most of the difficulties and disappointments of the vine growers of Aiken proceed from the nonconformity of the season of vintage with the season of fermentation; and, notwithstanding the beautiful and highly esteemed varieties so successfully cultivated about Aiken, they are all obnoxious to the charge of being objectionable to wine manufacturing purposes, only because of their maturity in July and August.

But while desiring better things, we need not neglect what we have. Nature is ever bountiful, and if she has delayed the winter beyond the reach of duration of the grape, she has fixed a temperature beneath the soil adequate to our purposes, and may be reached by moderate labor. The mean annual temperature of Aiken is about 62° ; hence, cellars excavated from twenty to forty feet will always preserve this temperature, and fermentation can be safely conducted at 65° . A cellar of sufficient dimensions and depth will sensibly correct the error already committed, and it may be advisable for the association to undertake on its own charge the construction of one for experimental purposes, and have it completed before the next vintage. When its efficacy shall be established, private enterprise will construct as many more as are requisite for the increasing productions. The advantages of wine-cellars are fully established in all wine-producing regions from the Grecian islands to the Rhine, and how much more necessary must they be to us who are constrained to vintage in the midst of summer. The cellar is designed to contain the fermenting vats and casks, not only to protect them from the influence of the constant summer heat, but also from the general vicissitudes of the climate under which we undertake to perform incompatible operations. They are the security of the wine maker, and are as necessary in winter as in summer. The appendage of a wine-cellar to a vineyard is as necessary as the erection of a barn to a field, or a corn-crib to a corn-patch; and he who is convinced of these necessary buildings on a farm, can fully estimate the value of a wine-cellar, and may hereafter wonder how he could have concluded to plant a vineyard and neglected to construct a wine-cellar. But a ready excuse may be given: "How was I to know before trial that my vines would produce fruit, and that those fruit contained the proper elements for wine making? My neighbors who are in advance of me produce a sour wine, although I eat a sweet grape. If their sweet grapes only make a sour wine, which I cannot drink, I see no use for a cellar, nor a vineyard either. I have no means of knowing whether it is the grape or the man that makes the

sour wine, but I have strong suspicions that both are to blame. The man either does not know how, or the grape is wrong in something. Frenchmen have tried with no better success, and I have seen no wine made in Aiken like that which I buy in Charleston." These are natural, interesting and grave reflections, and worthy of a reply; and if we succeed in demonstrating that the fault is neither in the fruit nor the man, but in the concurring condition of things, we may hope to induce our complainant not only to plant a vineyard, but dig a deep cellar also.

In the examination of details for proper replies to the doubts above expressed, it is necessary to state some things which may be known in order to reach other things which are unknown. It is convenient to commence with foreign wines before we discuss the domestic, or examine minutely the materials which we possess for making wines like those which are imported. It is important to compare the composition of the juice of foreign grapes with corresponding wines said to be manufactured out of them, and from researches and comparisons between the native grape juice and the commercial wine, we may be enabled to draw valuable conclusions, not only beneficial to health but to the purse, and determine the exact line where nature ceases her beneficent work, and where man commences to display his fraud, avarice and rapacity.

By a careful examination of what is done abroad out of the same materials which nature has supplied at home, we can learn how to profit by what is beneficial, and to reject what is injurious. Art has limits as well as qualities; and impositions on the credulous and ignorant are not unfrequently practiced by the wine makers. But, in a country like ours, where the vineyard may be made infinite, a fair article may always be produced in sufficient quantity to supply a liberal demand, and no more art need be learned nor practiced beyond what is necessary to supply a good, sound wine.

OF WINE AND GRAPE JUICE.

Wine is said to be "the juice of the grape, fermented;" the juice of the grape is the fluid obtained by expressing the ripe fruit; and fermentation is a chemical process, by which changes are effected in the constituents of the grape juice. By fermentation, grape juice is transformed into wine; and from grape juice alone can wine be made. By fermentation, the grape sugar of the juice is transformed into alcohol, with the escape of certain quantities of carbon and oxygen, which are no longer requisite to the sugar, and do not enter into the composition of the alcohol. During fermentation, the sugar may be said to die and the alcohol to be born; thus, the death of the sugar of the grape juice, and the birth of the alcohol of wine, is really and truly the only change effected; and the change of the name

of juice into wine implies no other process. All true wine must have been once grape juice, and all grape juice contains the material out of which wine may be fermented. But if, by a dexterous operation, the sugar of the juice could be extracted, and the deficiency replaced by alcohol in corresponding quantity, it would be a question of casuistry to determine whether we have made wine. We have wine in composition, but we have not prepared it according to definition. We have the same results, but have not pursued the established method. If, on the other hand, we abstract the alcohol from wine and restore the proper quantity of sugar, we truly have not grape juice, but we have its equivalent. We have a fluid identical in composition with it, and which is capable of being again converted into wine.

I have been thus prolix, to endeavor to remove from the mind of the reader any remnant of superstition which former ignorance may have attached to the so-called vinous fermentation. It is nothing more than an expression indicating the breaking up of one equivalent of grape sugar, composed of carbon 24, hydrogen 28, oxygen 28; into four equivalents of alcohol, composed, each, of carbon 4, hydrogen 6, oxygen 2; eight equivalents of carbonic acid, composed, each, of carbon 1, oxygen 2, and four equivalents of water, composed, each, of oxygen 1, hydrogen 1. Thus, 100 pounds of crystalline grape sugar contained in the juice, is resolved into 46.46 pounds of alcohol, which makes it wine; 9.09 pounds of water which also remains, and 44.44 pounds of carbonic acid which escapes, producing the effervescence which constitutes the wonder and astonishment of the uninformed. If, then, the vinous fermentation is so simple in its intents and results, we may dismiss it with the single remark that, wherever sugar may be, and from whatever source it may have been derived, it is prone to change into alcohol under favorable conditions; and its progeny, alcohol, is prone to a similar fermentation, by which acetic acid is produced. The conversion of alcohol into acetic acid is as simple as the conversion of sugar into alcohol, and an accurate knowledge of the process is as important as that of the vinous fermentation. We wait to learn whether our grape juice shall be wine or vinegar. The vinous fermentation makes it wine; the acetic fermentation makes it vinegar. It may be wine to-day, and vinegar a week hence; and the only change by which this disastrous conversion has been produced, has been the absorption of 2 atoms of oxygen from the air, and the consequent loss of 2 atoms of hydrogen. Thus, alcohol stands: carbon 4, hydrogen 6, oxygen 2; by substitution of 2 atoms of oxygen for 2 atoms of hydrogen, we have acetic acid: carbon 4, hydrogen 4, oxygen 4—an article which is not wine, although it is fermented grape juice; and no casuistry can convince the world that grape juice which has undergone the acetic fermentation is wine. The practical

fact connected with these fermentations is, that the acetic is not prone to occur at a temperature below 65° , while the vinous will; and the vinous will rather cease altogether at 65° than pass into the acetic. Hence, the principle of cool cellars in which the vinous fermentation is to be conducted. It is now easy to understand the difference between wine and white wine vinegar, as produced from the juice of the grape. By fermentation in a cool locality, the sugar of the grape is transformed into alcohol, which remains mixed with the water, acids and salts of the juice; and when the alcohol is in due proportion to the water, the compound, as wine, may be preserved for an indefinite length of time. But if the locality be warm, and the alcohol deficient in quantity, the mixture assumes the acetic fermentation, and white wine vinegar is produced, which may also be preserved for an indefinite period. Thus, it is obvious that the temperature of the place, and quantity of sugar originally present in the juice, have determined the kind of fermentation, and produce specific results. Our wishes are not consulted. We asked for wine, and have received vinegar. Ask again, but first learn how to ask correctly, and wine will be accorded.

To contemplate wine, then, in its simplest form, is to identify it with grape juice, in which the process of vinous fermentation has converted 100 parts of sugar into 46.46 parts of alcohol, and calculation can soon convert 46.46 parts of alcohol into 100 parts of sugar, and restore the original grape juice. It is on this simple plan that I propose to compare the wines of the world with the grape juice of South Carolina, and determine theoretically, and then practically, the great problem that involves the prosperity of Aiken, and with it the whole southern portion of the former United States.

The grape grows and matures, the agriculturist has finished his labor, the chemist now takes up the subject, advances a few steps, and then the practical artist completes the work.

ART. IV.—DR. CARTWRIGHT ON THE NEGRO, REVIEWED.

Dr. Clarke argues, that

“The very name *serpent* comes from *serpo*, to *creep*; and, therefore, to such it could be neither *curse* nor *punishment* to go on their bellies, i. e., to *creep on* as they had done from their creation.”

Here he begs the question. He assumes that serpents were originally reptiles, and, in proof, adduces a name derived from the Latin—a language which certainly does not date beyond the building of the Tower of Babel. It would be in point to show that the ophidian kind were named creepers before the

curse was pronounced against the nachash—but not that they have been so called since—for whatever they were before, they have been creepers ever since, and might, therefore, be properly named *serpents*, whether originally created or subsequently condemned to creep.

But, admit that no serpent ever walked erect, it avails nothing until it shall be shown that the nachash walked erect before the curse. This, says Dr. Clarke, “is necessarily implied in his punishment—on thy belly shalt thou go.” By no means. Nothing more is implied than that he did not go on his belly, which does not involve walking erect any more than walking on all fours or flying. There is no need to know what or how great the change was, otherwise it would have been revealed. It has not been revealed; reason cannot discover it; and fancy may invent ten thousand schemes, yet not approach the truth. Even if it were admitted that Dr. Clarke’s hypothesis will explain all the phenomena, this is not enough to establish it, for it is a principle of the law of circumstantial evidence that “nothing must be inferred, because, if true, it would account for the facts;” but the circumstances must not be “capable of solution on any other reasonable hypothesis.”*

“The force and effect of circumstantial evidence depend upon its incompatibility with, and incapability of, explanation or solution upon any other supposition than that of the truth of the fact which it is adduced to prove; the mode of argument resembling the method of demonstration by the *reductio ad absurdum*.”—Wills’ *Circumstantial Evidence*, 17.

Dr. Clarke’s hypothesis cannot stand this test, for it is not difficult to imagine a form for the nachash, requiring less change to convert it into the present form of serpents, than must have taken place to convert the ape from an erect to a horizontal progression. It is not necessary to borrow from heraldry the winged serpent, sometimes represented on the escutcheon; nor from mythology the emblem of *Cnepl*, the Good deity, found sculptured on a tomb in Thebes, for the pages of history furnish winged serpents in abundance. There are the serpents of Lybia and Arabia, with wings like a bat, which the south winds bring to Egypt; the same, probably, as the *saraph*, which is said to be provided with a sort of wings or parachute, by means of which, leaning on the extremity of its tail, it moves with great velocity. Serpents of India are mentioned, two cubits long, that flew about in the night. And modern writers attest the existence of winged serpents in Europe. Scalliger mentions a snake found among the Pyrenees, from whose sides proceeded cartilages in the form of wings. Le Blanc, quoted by Bochart, says that the woods at the head of lake Chiamay are infested with large serpents, with bat-like wings, by the aid of which they move with great rapidity, leaning on the ex-

* Wills on Circumstantial Evidence, 150.

tremity of their tails.* These statements may be fabulous or exaggerated; but there is as much plausibility in the imagination that the original nachash was a flying serpent, as that he was an erect ape. Indeed, the former opinion is favored by some, and seems to be supported by Hebrew tradition. A work already cited says:

"The former part of this curse [on thy belly shalt thou go] will become intelligible enough if we suppose that the serpent was previously gifted with the power of flying. This, then, which comes to us as a mere matter of tradition, bears on the very face of it so strong a probability, and makes the nature of the curse so clearly intelligible, that we can see but little objection to receive it."—*Echoes of the Universe*, p. 115.

If the nachash possessed wings, which were reduced to wing-like membranes or parachutes, or were entirely removed, he was compelled to cease flying, and to go on his belly, by a slighter change than would have reduced him from an erect to a cheiropedal carriage.

But he that undertakes to determine the original form of the nachash, so that it may be the foundation of an argument, is certainly "intruding into those things which he hath not seen."† Mr. Pope's interrogatory concerning men, may be equally applied to things below,—

"What can we reason but from what we know?"

Of the form and faculties of the nachash before the curse, nothing is known; therefore, upon them no reliable argument can be established. But of the serpent, the ape and the negro, as they are, enough is known from which to reason. Leaving the realms of fancy, therefore, let those arguments be examined which are deduced from what is known. Dr. Clarke does not intimate that the words "on thy belly shalt thou go," are not a correct rendering of the original Hebrew. While those words do not imply that the nachash "walked erect," nor reveal his method of progression before the curse, they more than imply what it should be thenceforth. The ape does not go on his belly; the serpent does. To escape the obvious conclusion from these facts, Dr. Clarke writes, "on thy belly (i. e., on all fours) shalt thou go;" and he gives this paraphrase: "Thou shalt no longer walk erect, but mark the ground equally with thy hands and feet."‡ This is no accurate amplification of the words "on thy belly," nor is the phrase "on all fours" their equivalent. It must be concluded, therefore, that the nachash may have gone on all fours or erect before the curse, but cannot have done so since; that the ape kind have gone either on all fours or erect ever since the curse; therefore, the nachash could not have been one

* Universal History, vol. i, p. 422. Vol. iii, p. 429, note S. Vol. xx, p. 69, Religious Encyclopædia, Title *Serpent*.

† Col. ii, 18.

‡ On Gen. iii, 14.

of that kind; that the serpent kind have gone literally on their bellies ever since the curse, and therefore the nachash may have been of the serpent kind.

The next specification of the curse is: "Dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life,"—which Dr. Clarke paraphrases thus: Thou shalt "feed like the most stupid and abject quadruped, without cleansing thy food;" and he remarks that the ape, though possessing all the means, never cleanses its food.* According to Nicander, one of the most noxious species of serpents, the *chersydrus*, or *saraph* already mentioned, subsists on dust alone.† This is not probable; yet it is quite as true of all serpents as of the ape, that they do not cleanse their food; and while the ape feeds chiefly on fruit, nuts and vegetables, the serpent feeds on toads, reptiles and other animals caught in the dirt, and swallowed whole—thus including their intestines. Moving with their heads near the earth, and constantly licking out their tongues, they must take up more or less dust. If this part of the curse is to be taken literally, the balance is in favor of the serpent; but Rev. Henry Christmas thinks that the actual food of the nachash is not here intended. He says—

"It is one of the best known and [most] frequently employed of Eastern idioms—a form of speech with which all who have read even the most common of Oriental tales must be familiar. To eat dust or dirt denotes being humbled, cast down from a high position and placed in one of degradation. It is impossible to read any Eastern story without meeting with some such expression as this: "What dirt have I eaten?"—that is to say, what humiliation have I been subjected to? It is frequently said: "I will make him eat dirt"—I will subject him to some degrading penance. With so ancient and common and expressive an idiom before our eyes, surely, we can at once understand the nature of the curse: "Dust shalt thou eat"—that is, humiliation shall be thy lot—"all the days of thy life." . . . Two passages show how figurative the expression is. . . In Isaiah (lxv, 25), it is said "dust shall be the serpent's meat"—that is, doubtless, the great adversary shall be confounded and humiliated. . . In Micah (vii, 17), it is said the nations shall be terrified at the coming of the Lord, "and they shall lick the dust like a serpent." Humiliation is in all these cases plainly implied."—*Echoes of the Universe*, pp. 115, 116.

The curse against the nachash proceeds: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." In view of this, Dr. Clarke says, concerning the *simia* or ape species:

"There is scarcely an animal in the universe so detested by *women* as they are; and, indeed, *men* look on them as continual caricatures of themselves."—*On Gen. iii*, 15.

Women are generally timid, and fear all animals with which they are not familiar; but there is no evidence that they feel enmity toward the ape, and, certainly, none that they feel such

* On Gen. iii, 14.

† Univ. Hist., vol. xvii, 459, 460, note Z.

a degree of enmity toward them as toward serpents. Children are often caressingly called jackanapes, monkeys, etc., but never serpents. The strongest expression of intense hatred is: "I hate him as I do a snake," or "as I do a viper;" but never as "I do an ape." In rare instances, men have had serpents for pets. It is scarcely credible that any woman ever had such perverted taste. But "it was formerly much the fashion, with both sexes, to keep apes and monkeys in a state of familiar domestication as pets."*

No one feels compunctious visitings for having killed any kind of serpent; but many who have been induced, by mere wantonness, the love of science, or any other motive, to kill any of the satyrus kind, have "acknowledged that they were distressed by their human-like expression of countenance," and "confessed that the sight was such as almost to make them question the nature of the act they were committing."† The gorilla, according to M. Du Chailhe, manifests unbounded rage and exasperation when brought face to face with man; but his account is disputed by some naturalists, and even his account makes it the enemy of all other animals as well as of men, so that even the lion has quailed and retired before this ferocious ape."‡

Dr. Clarke seems conscious that he has not made out his case as to enmity between the human and the simian race, and adds:

"But Satan, who actuated this creature, is alone intended in this part of the prophetic declaration."

This, if true, overthrows his own arguments: that women detest apes, and that no peculiar enmity exists between men and serpents. But it is by no means probable. It seems that here, as in many other portions of the prophetic writings, there is a dual signification; or, as Dr. Clarke says, with reference to the whole curse against the tempter, "here we must consider a twofold sentence—one on *Satan*, and the other on the *agent* he employed." As it regards Satan, Dr. Clarke well remarks that the seed of the woman is the person who was to come by woman, without the concurrence of man; and that, in consequence of this purpose of God, Jesus Christ was born of a virgin. But as it regards the nachash, the seed of the woman is the human race—between whom and the serpent, there is enmity. The ape and orang fight with clubs and missiles, as well as their teeth, and the heel of man is the least probable point of attack. But the grovelling position of the serpent makes the foot or heel the most probable point of his attack. On the other hand, man is as apt to shoot at the heart as the

* New Amer. Cyclopædia.

† Zoological Recreations, pp. 216, 247.

‡ London Quarterly Review, Am. Ed., vol. lv, p. 265.

head of the ape, but strikes especially at the head of the serpent. But there is no proof, says Dr. Clarke, "that men hate serpents *more* than they do other noxious animals." Nor is such proof needed, since the curse says only that there shall be enmity—not that there shall be more enmity than between any other animal and man. It is very safe to affirm, with Dr. Scott, that "from that season, serpents have been more shunned and persecuted unto death, as enemies to the human race, than almost any other animal." Again: Dr. Clarke remarks that "men have much more enmity to the rat and magpie than to serpents, because the former destroy grain," etc. Here the animosity is for a special cause; it is rather hatred of the mischief than of the animal. But man hates the serpent, that will never harm him so long as he keeps his distance; and even when remote from any human habitation, and pressed for time, he will often dismount, and go in hot pursuit of a serpent of the most innoxious kind. Dr. Clarke says:

"It has yet to be discovered that the serpentine race have any peculiar enmity against mankind. . . . Serpents in general, so far from seeking to do mischief, flee their approach and avoid their dwelling."

Their flight proves the contradictory of what it is adduced to prove. Why do serpents, that glide fearlessly among other animals, flee the approach of man, except from a consciousness that he is an enemy? The effect produced on a rattlesnake by the approach of a man, is thus described by Chateaubriand:

"The haughty reptile curled himself into a spiral line, flattened his head, inflated his cheeks, contracted his lips, displayed his envenomed fangs and his bloody throat; his double tongue glowed like two flames of fire; his eyes were burning coals; his body, swollen with rage, rose and fell like the bellows of a forge; his dilated skin assumed a dull and scaly appearance; and his tail, which sounded the denunciation of death, vibrated with so great rapidity as to resemble a light vapor."—*Religious Encyclopædia. Tûle, Adder.*

A more graphic picture of intense hatred it would be difficult to find. It is recorded that Moses cast down his rod, and it became a serpent (*nachash*), of what kind we know not, says Dr. Clarke; "but it was either of a kind that he had not seen before, or one that he knew to be dangerous; for, it is said, he fled from before it."* Why did he flee, except from fear? Why fear, except that he felt there was enmity? How was the serpent "dangerous," except as it possessed both the means and the disposition to inflict injury?

The Rev. W. D. Scull, of Florida, in an article entitled: "Dr. Cartwright on the Negro race," says:

The LXX render "*nachash*" *ophis*—that is, serpent. The translation in question was 300 years B. C. After this 360 years, St. Paul (2 Cor. xi, 3) informs us that it was a serpent that deceived Eve. "But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent (*ophis*) beguiled Eve." And, finally, in Rev. xii,

* On Exod. iv, 3.

9; xx, 3, the serpent (ophis) is called the "devil and satan;" and in the vulgate (A. D. 390), St. Jerome translates "nachash" *serpens*.—*De Bow's Review*. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 713. December, 1860.

These arguments have been anticipated by Dr. Clarke, who says :

"It can be no solid objection to the above mode of solution that Satan, in different parts of the New Testament, is called the *serpent*, the *serpent* that deceived Eve by his subtlety, the old serpent, etc. ; for the New Testament writers have borrowed the word from the Septuagint, and the Septuagint themselves use it in a *vast variety* and *latitude of meaning*. . . Besides, the New Testament writers seem to lose sight of the animal, or instrument, and speak only of Satan himself, as the cause of the transgression and instrument of evil."—*On Gen. iii*, 1.

Had Mr. Scull consulted Dr. Clarke's Commentary before replying to Dr. Cartwright, he might easily have disposed of these arguments. As the Septuagint were uninspired men, errors are to be expected in their translation; but there are many reasons for thinking this is not one of them. They were learned Jews, and, according to the most probable accounts, translated the Hebrew Scriptures for the use of Hellenistic Jews. They, certainly, had every facility for ascertaining how the learned Jews understood the word nachash, as applied to the tempter. Bearing in mind that, according to Dr. Clarke himself, the word nachash is sometimes properly translated "serpent," a very important consideration is the one already alluded to; that, as far back as the time of Jacob, long before the Hebrew Scriptures were written, very long before they were translated into Greek, the serpent was considered, among the Jews, a proper symbol of subtlety, prudence, cunning. Moses, in the book of Genesis, wrote that the nachash, by which Eve was beguiled, was more subtle than any other beast, and that he should wound the heel of the woman's seed. The same writer, in the same book, records the prophecy of Jacob, in which the same word is employed, with reference not only to the same attribute of subtlety, guile, cunning, but to wounding the same part—not, indeed, of man, but of a horse. This seems to identify it with the nachash of the garden. In the latter passage, the word nachash is used, not only to designate a creature wounding by the ophidian method of biting, but in connection with, and as a synonym of another word (*shephiphon*), which, it is admitted, designates some species of serpent. This seems to identify the nachash with the serpent. Thus, it appears that the word nachash designates the same creature in the third, as in the forty-ninth chapter of Genesis, and that in the latter place it designates a serpent, and not an ape or negro; from which the conclusion is inevitable, that in the third chapter it designates neither ape nor negro, but serpent. Let it be further borne in mind, that in several of the parallelisms of the poetic parts of the Bible, besides the one just alluded to, the

word *nachash* is used, in connection with some other name, for a serpent. David mentions the wicked as "speaking lies," as did the *nachash* of Paradise, and proceeds to say :

"Their poison is like the poison of a serpent (*nachash*) ;
They are like the deaf adder (*peten*) that stoppeth her ear."*

Again, the Psalmist says :

"They have sharpened their tongues like a serpent (*nachash*) ;
Adders' (*hachshov*) poison is under their lips."†

And Micah says :

"They shall lick the dust like a serpent (*nachash*) ,
They shall move out of their holes like the worms (*zahal*) of the earth."‡

On the other hand, no passage can be found in the Bible where *nachash* clearly means ape, or where it is linked in poetic parallelism with another name for ape or satyr ; no living Jew will give ape as a possible translation of it ; nor does any Hebrew lexicographer so define it.

While the uninspired seventy might err in translating the Hebrew *nachash* by the Greek *ophis*, yet it is not likely that the inspired New Testament writers would follow them in an error so glaring as the substitution of a serpent for an ape, and constantly speak of the devil as a serpent, when it would have been so much more appropriate, with reference to the first temptation, to have called him an ape. It is evident, too, that the New Testament writers did not, as Dr. Clarke supposes, "lose sight of the animal, or instrument, and adopt the word *ophis* merely because it stands for *nachash* in the version of the LXX ; but, without thinking of the animal itself, for sometimes *ophis* is omitted and *echidna* used, signifying a viper or adder, which is one of the serpent kind. John the Baptist and Jesus both denounced the Jews as *gennemata echidnōn*—a "generation of vipers."§ At another time, Jesus tells them : "Ye are of your father, the devil."|| These passages are parallel, and show that the word *echidna* will properly apply, as well as *ophis*, to the order of animals by one of which Eve was beguiled ; or it may be that the one word is generic, the other specific, like *serpent* and *viper*. The words of Jesus, just quoted, Dr. Clarke paraphrases thus : "Ye are of the seed of the old serpent."¶ As an equivalent of the expression "generation of vipers," applied to the Jews, he gives, "serpentine brood, from a serpentine stock ;" and remarks :

"As their fathers were, so were they, children of the wicked one. The Jews were the seed of the serpent who should bruise the heel of the woman's seed, and whose head should be bruised by him."—*On Matt. iii, 7.*

The words "generation of vipers," were applied by the Saviour to the Jews in a still more remarkable connection, for

* Ps. lviii, 4.

† Ps. cxl, 3.

‡ Mic. vii, 17.

§ Matt. 3-7 ; xii, 34. Luke iii, 7.

|| John viii, 44.

¶ On John viii, 37-44.

they were used as a synonym for that very word *ophis*, which the Septuagint gives as a translation of *nachash*. Jesus said: *Opheis, gennemata echidnōn*, "serpents, generation of vipers."* Thus, he who knows "all things," in designating the Jews as children of the wicked one, and him conversely as their father, applied not only the word *ophis*, which, according to Dr. Clarke, he might have adopted without reference to the true meaning; but, also, *echidna*, which he must have selected for its meaning alone, and that meaning is *viper*—an animal which goes on its belly, is at enmity with man, and belongs to the order ophidia.

Thus have Dr. Clarke's arguments been disposed of. While his learning, conscientiousness and piety are unquestionable, it will be seen that he is deficient in logic, and is liable to be biased by his foregone conclusions. He often furnishes the refutation of his own arguments, and violates, when the exigencies of his theory demand it, those rules of interpretation by which, at other times, he would support that theory. Thus, to prove that the *nachash* "was endued with the gift of speech," he says: "God did not qualify this creature with speech for the occasion, and it is not intimated that there was any other agent that did it." But he does not wait for intimations to support those conjectures which harmonize with his theory, for he soon assumes that chattering is all that the *simia* kind have left "of their original gift of speech, of which they appear to have been deprived at the fall, as a part of their punishment." Yet, there is no intimation that they ever possessed that gift, or that such deprivation was any part of the punishment of the *nachash*. The same liberality of assumption would suffice to refute every objection he urges against the ophidian theory, even admitting his facts. When he objects that serpents have no voice, and "can only hiss," it might be replied they were deprived of voice "as a part of their punishment." When he urges that he does not "find that the serpentine genus are remarkable for intelligence," the reply is ready, they have been deprived of their superior subtlety "as a part of their punishment." This, however, would be contending rather against the man than against his error; a fault too common to theological polemics. A better method has been aimed at, and, it is believed, not without success.

* Matt. xxiii, 33.

ART. V.—EXPERIENCES OF THE PAST—OUR GUIDE FOR THE FUTURE.*

The preface to the work whose title we prefix, is dated February 25, 1860, and informs us that "the different parts have been written at different times, and are now hastily thrown together because of a supposed application of this subject to the present state of public affairs." It appears, therefore, to have been completed at an early period of that stormy session of the thirty-sixth congress: the first or long session of that body, and immediately subsequent to the termination, by a success of the Black Republicans, of the long struggle for the Speakership of the last House of Representatives of the late United States. If the subject considered was then appropriate to the times, it is certainly not less important at present to the citizens of the South, who have since entered, under more hopeful auspices than ever, on a new career of independence and self-government.

It would, doubtless, violate the delicacy of the author, who has chosen to preserve his incognito by the adoption of a *nom de plume*, were we to reveal his name; but, in the political and literary circles of Virginia, that name has long been extensively and favorably known; nor does it now rank below eminence in the rolls of military distinction, for the achievements of its gallant bearer, at the head of a distinguished corps of Virginians, during the present war.

In times such as these, the first principles of social and political organization are forced upon the attention of all men. Under ordinary circumstances, citizens are content to perform their routine functions, as such, under their established party organizations; providing for the regular legislative, executive and judicial administration of public affairs, with but slight and occasional reference to either the fundamental doctrines upon which the State or nation was originally erected into a body politic, or the historical antecedents whereby those organic principles have been developed into full vitality, and exhibited in the vigorous maturity of their results. But, an important change of relation toward other communities with whom a State has been internationally and politically connected, especially by the bonds of a Confederate Union, and particularly the sovereign act of resumption by a State of those delegated powers entrusted to a central authority—these, and all such alterations, whether they do or do not, strictly speaking, amount to revolution—invariably call upon all thinking individuals to investigate critically the original sources of power, the essential conditions of political society, the extent and limits of

* The Lost Principle, or the Sectional Equilibrium—How it was Created—How Destroyed—How it may be Restored. By "Barbarossa." Richmond, Va.: James Woodhouse & Co. 1860.

Governmental authority, the desirable modifications of organization, and to consider, for the purpose of future guidance, the practical experience of the past.

In this point of view, the work before us is one of deep interest, and calculated to inculcate most valuable lessons. It is a compendious but very complete history of the transactions of 1787 and 1788, which gave birth to the constitution of the late United States, and of the ratification of that compact by the State of Virginia, the ninth State adopting it, by which act it was made operative as a form of government. But, the narrative is given by the author only for the purpose of enforcing a great leading argument, only as an instrument for the establishment of conclusions relative to the object of the union of States then formed, the failure of the machinery then instituted to attain that object, and, therefore, the duty devolving upon the present generation to rectify the errors of their predecessors, as incumbents of public authority, by a recurrence to the true principle of a Confederate Government, and to the real interest of the Southern States, separately and collectively.

It would have conduced to the usefulness of the work, rendered it more worthy of the author, and spared the reader some unnecessary labor, had a summary of contents been either prefixed or affixed to the volume, as usual in books of a similar character. In default of this aid to perusal, it is somewhat difficult to pursue the main line of argument, as the method is in a measure obscured by the copiousness of incidental inferences and collateral deductions; all, however, when examined, bearing upon and illustrating with additional force and light the principal purpose of the ratiocination.

We shall presently proceed to indicate concisely the chain of facts and arguments conducting to the author's chief conclusion, premising that no mere synopsis or abstract, however full, can possibly be made to supply the place of the work at large, which, with appendices, occupies only two hundred and sixty-six pages, and, therefore, demands but a limited period of time for perusal, though entitled to thorough and repeated study. In the course of this article we shall also assume the privilege of introducing, occasionally, such reflections as are suggested to us by the subject or by the remarks of the author.

The work is dedicated to the memory of the late Hon. John MacPherson Berrien, formerly senator in congress from the State of Georgia, to whom the author acknowledges his obligations for the great service of convincing his mind of the necessity to democratic institutions; of the servitude of the laboring class, or, in a converse form of expression, of the impossibility of real freedom for the citizen, except on the condition of his possessing a full control over the menial and servile body; a truth which, among other elementary propositions, has gained among those who had previously left it unconsidered, a very

extensive recognition, in consequence of the present reconsideration of our foreign relations already noticed. The book is addressed "to the young men of the slave-holding section"—now, thank God, to be addressed in their reasserted dignity as men, not of a section, but of a nation, founded upon this essential basis of social and political order, and disembarassed from all connection with communities attempting to maintain their coherence without that necessary condition of durable institutions. The predictions of Henry and others in 1788, and of our author in 1860, have been fulfilled in every point; the quotation of them will furnish an appropriate text for the historical sketch and argumentative summary which we are about to condense from his luminous pages.

"The objections against the federal constitution," proposed at Philadelphia in 1787, were—

1. "That the magnitude of the powers entrusted to the federal agent would, in their development, produce a consolidation of the States into one empire."

2. "That the powers thus accumulated at the centre, were so distributed between the North and South that, by the trick of a minority representation, the latter would be brought under the political vassalage of the former." (P. 115.)

Both these results we have seen produced, since, not content with the long endurance by the South of the latter consequence within the Union, the attempt to enforce the former has driven her from it, while, with regard to the Northern section, the consolidation has been thoroughly effected. Again, in the last page of his work, our author says:

"If it be true that feebleness in the federal agent was about to destroy, in 1787, the confederacy of the States, there can be no sort of doubt that the excessive power conferred upon it by the present constitution is about to destroy the union between the North and the South." (P. 226.)

The author justly discriminates between the "Union" which was antecedent, not only to the last written constitution, but also to the articles of confederation of the States, and that special form of central Government created by the States in assenting to those instruments. And he marks, by his citations from history, his true appreciation of the real origin of our people as a civil community, furnished with institutions of domestic and political government by virtue of hereditary franchises and customs—in a word, by the unwritten constitution derived from their ancestors and cherished as an heirloom by the colonists.

In the division of his treatise into three parts, the author has naturally allotted a far larger space to the first question, viz: "How the Sectional Equilibrium was Created," than to the others: "How It was Destroyed," and "How It May be Restored." Nevertheless, the second of these, or the history of anti-Southern federal policy, contains the very kernel of the

lesson designed for the instruction of the present generation. We commence in a remote region of history, according to the motto of this book: "*melius est petere fontes*," etc.

The organic law, the unwritten constitution, of any and every political society, which gives rules to the development of its civilization, is to be ascertained from its earliest history alone. The ideas and customs of its founders are the germs of its florescence and its fruitage, and under all subsequent modifications, continually reappear to attest their origin and their permanence. Many ancient colonies appear to have issued from their parent nations in a state of complete organization, led by princes and priests, with a body of followers already classified into orders, ranks and occupations. Most were the results of military conquest, but some, as certain Grecian colonies in Asia, and, perhaps, one or more Egyptian colonies in Greece itself, were established under the impulse of emigration for industrial purposes only, and designed to relieve the old State from a redundant population. Without dwelling upon instances so distant in time and place, we will notice more minutely the colonization of America. The Spanish discovery was stimulated, in the heart of Columbus himself, by religious motives. He had long cherished, with the ardor of a crusader, the desire of contributing to the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre; and supposing the western shores of the Atlantic Ocean to be identical with the eastern coast of Asia, he even delineated his projected route from thence to Joppa, where he was to meet volunteers to be enlisted under his command, and march at their head to Jerusalem. So prominently in his mind remained this design throughout life, that his last will and testament directs his son, as heir of his official dignities, to fund in the Bank of Genoa his eighth share, as Admiral and Viceroy of the Indies, of all treasures and emoluments accruing, until the accumulation should suffice for the prosecution of the project. He also strongly influenced the noble Isabella of Castile in his favor, by dwelling upon the prospects of conversion of pagans to Christianity. His own life leaves no doubt of the sincerity of his devotion. But his immediate followers, although they did not altogether neglect to provide for the religious instruction of the native tribes, yet pursued their schemes of settlement under the influence of a mere thirst of gold and treasure. Each expedition, though accompanied by a few missionaries, had in view but a single object; the same that, in our own day, has incidentally led to the reclamation of California from the wilderness. These colonists were for the most part young cavaliers of high birth, but limited fortune, whose prerogative it was to lead in the armies of their country; and while many returned to Spain, those who remained established, as the historical constitution of the colonies, a military aristocracy, with the adjunct of a serf population. To the body of inferior people

in Mexico and Peru, who had groaned for ages under the scourge of native taskmasters, who had never participated in the privileges of the priesthood, or in the franchises of the State, under their ancient aboriginal chieftains, this exclusion from public power was no additional grievance, and their condition was probably ameliorated under Spanish rule. Certainly, they were, at least, not exterminated, as the Indians have been in the British colonies, however the superior race may have suffered deterioration from association with the inferior. It is estimated that, in Mexico, the population of pure Spanish descent now amounts to no more than one million; that of the mixed blood, to about seven millions. Now, these degenerate Spanish Americans exhibit a melancholy but instructive example of the futility and ruinous consequences of an attempt to engraft upon a people a merely theoretical system of government. Though the experience of the French themselves toward the close of the last century might have afforded a sufficient warning against such rashness, yet those colonies, and since that time several other countries, have seemed blind to the beacon light, and deaf to the Cassandra cry; or rather, indeed, have hearkened to the Syren invitation, and steered their ships of State full upon the same destructive shoals of political experiment that were strewn with former wrecks: as if nations were self-constituted, and could operate at pleasure under any one of the paper constitutions which political charlatans, like the Abbé Sièyes, have in modern times kept on file in the pigeon holes of their desks.

In strong contrast to this fatal course stands the natural and steady growth of the British colonial States, ever preserving their hereditary principles as a birthright. In all feudal realms, during the middle ages, we find at the head of the State a lord paramount, a chief presiding among his peers, *primus inter pares*, ruling by and with the advice and consent of three estates, the clergy, the nobility, and the commons. This third estate originally, in most countries, consisted only of deputies or delegates from the chartered towns; the municipal corporations, which, instituted by the king as a counterpoise to the power of the great feudatories, gave him some point of resistance against his formidable vassals, additional to that which he could derive from the limited domains of the crown. These towns or burghs, emancipated by royal charter from the immediate baronial jurisdiction, materially assisted the crown both with men and money; during the sanguinary civil wars of the fifteenth century in England, it was observed that the side supported by the City of London, with her large resources and celebrated trainbands, was uniformly successful. These burghs have frequently been acknowledged as the cradle of popular and representative government; nor was it usually the case, at first, that the rural population should elect deputies to

sit with the burgesses as representatives of the third estate; but in England, when the kings ceased to summon every lord of a manor, and confined their writs to the greater barons who held immediately of the crown, then by a policy consummated under Simon de Montfort, in the reign of Henry III, the minor barons, or landed gentry in general, were invited to elect representatives to a lower house of parliament, which was thus constituted of these knights of the shire and burgesses—a distinction still observed in that body. (Vid. Blackstone and al.) Now, for these knights of the shire, every freeholder of land; as for the municipal burgesses, every citizen of a town, free of the corporation, either by inheritance, by apprenticeship, or otherwise, was entitled to cast his suffrage; while in other countries, as in all at an earlier period, none but the cities and towns were represented as the third estate, because the whole free rural population was fully represented among the nobility, since in Germany, Burgundy, etc., every petty baron claimed his seat in council. The nobles of Spain were accustomed to retain their caps for a few moments after being seated in the cortes, in token of their equality with the king. In the old ballads of England, the king is frequently styled a "peer." But this separation of classes in the parliament of England, and reduction of the younger branches of the nobility and untitled proprietors to the rank of commoners, has unquestionably contributed, in a very great degree, to the stability and elasticity of British institutions. Our author notices the existence in England, at an early date, of a class of yeomen freeholders, quite superior in degree and in personal qualifications to any continental peasantry. This class was socially interposed between the gentry of whom we have just spoken and the serfs or hinds. They constituted, as our author quotes from Bacon, the redoubtable and invincible infantry of English armies; they furnished the archers of Agincourt, Cressy and Poitiers, the "stable bands of foot," whose relative place was imperfectly supplied, in continental armies, by mercenary Switzers and other adventurers. It is certain, from the pictures of feudal life left us by the chroniclers and historians of medieval Europe, that in France, Italy, Germany, etc., with the exception of citizens of towns, the entire population was divided into the two classes of noblesse and peasantry, the former constituting the cavalry of their forces, while in England a numerous body of independent freehold or leasehold small farmers, was interposed between the cavalier and the servile hind, who was nowhere trained to arms. These yeomen, as our author further shows, were not only freemen, but masters, cultivating their own hereditary freeholds by the aid of persons held to labor, and were independent of all legal dictation from superiors, on the payment of a quit-rent, according to custom, and the due performance of military duty as their tenure, both under the lord of the manor.

Our author, in part I, chap. iv., sketches, graphically, the course of change which befell this stalwart yeomanry of England in their island home—how the bonds of society were impaired during the disastrous wars of the Roses—how the ancient families were nearly exterminated—the people reduced to extreme poverty—agriculture, which these wars had suspended, was not resumed with its former energy or success, pasturage succeeded to tillage, and tenants were displaced to make room for flocks of sheep. To such a height rose this evil, that enclosure acts, prohibiting the destruction of homesteads under stringent penalties, were enacted as early as the fourth year of the reign of Henry VII, and this policy was persisted in during a century and a half; and, though condemned by Hume, is strongly defended by Bacon. Severe measures in arrest of the same process of depopulation were also used, under the Protector Somerset, in the reign of Edward VI. Another cause of the decline of agricultural industry, and thence of the population engaged in it, which facilitated the depression of the yeomanry, and the transition of the servile class partly into day laborers, and partly into public paupers, was the rise and progress of manufacture in England, coupled with injudicious interference on the part of Government. The exportation of grain was prohibited; that of wool, for which there was a constant Flemish demand, was encouraged, and its production stimulated by many of those shallow and short-sighted contrivances which disgraced legislation before the principles of economical science were investigated. Unfortunately, we shall see that a similar policy has been pursued in later times, when the excuse of ignorance was no longer available, and the motives of cupidity and malevolence alone can be assigned. Under these multiplied burdens the stout yeomanry of “merry” England manfully bore themselves through every vicissitude, retaining their indomitable personal independence and sense of individual responsibility and honor, not claiming the position of others, but, like an American citizen, calmly insisting upon their own—how different a spectacle from the pale artisan of the present day in that country, who depends entirely on the proprietor of a mill, a factory, or still worse, of a mine; or from the agricultural laborer, who has occasionally seen his duke or squire at an election or a make believe merrymaking, while his daily bread is hardly earned by propitiating the steward of the great man; and the best chance of saving his children from those poor-houses which contain a large percentage of his class, consists in obtaining for them a preferment to the station of a liveried menial.

We must remember, now, that these colonies were settled exclusively by the “commons of England;” that when a noble or a scion of his house emigrated—excepting, of course, the cases of high officials, whose position in the colony was to be

but temporary, and of the proprietors themselves and their deputies, of whose relations to the colonists we have yet to speak—such aristocratic emigrants left beyond the Atlantic their political status of superiority, and arrived on the American shore in a position equal, and no more than equal, to their fellow adventurers of humbler origin. Hereditary claims to power were, from the first, ignored among the hardy colonists; personal qualifications alone furnished a motive for elevation to command; in a word, one only of the three estates of England can be found to have participated in the establishment of the settlements as permanent members of the society. True, the crown continued to be represented, either by commissioned governors or by its proprietary grantees; but this connection was in its nature artificial, and might have been foreseen to be merely temporary had the world then acquired experience in such colonization. The great feature, however, to which we call attention, is the absence of the aristocratic estate, as a political power, from the infant colonies. Hence, the later history of the colonies of England, in strong contrast to those of Spain, affords a striking instance of the preservation of their original institutions. The former could not naturally have been developed into anything but popular commonwealths, while the attempt to force republican forms upon the latter has resulted in a miserable failure.

Virginia, continues our author, presents a fair and perfect specimen of settlement by the commons of England. While, in the counties near the mouths of the rivers, the cavalier class predominated in numbers and gave tone to public and social life, the greater portion of the State was peopled by the yeomanry, who at various times brought their strong arms, fixed habits of personal independence and of domestic authority over bond-servants, and their cherished ideas of legal birthright or hereditary liberty, to a new soil, more propitious to them than the old homesteads, of which their fathers had witnessed the decline and spoliation; and on their farms, while agriculture flourished, and an able-bodied negro could be purchased in any market-town for a hogshead of tobacco, they led a life of rude plenty and homely comfort, such as their ancestors had enjoyed centuries before, with the additional advantage to the colonists of a good, plain education for their children, in the humble but useful old field schools, whose deserted sites are now overgrown with secondary thickets of oak and pine.

The population of Virginia retained a large degree of reverence for the Crown, perfectly compatible with their sturdy sense of individual independence. They long resisted the power of the English republic, and at length yielding submission to the government of Cromwell, they stipulated, in 1651, among other guarantees of their liberties, for a complete freedom of trade and an entire exemption from all taxation, except as imposed

by their own general assembly. Thus early were the colonists not only disposed, but able, to maintain their heritage of freedom, and to vindicate the principles of constitutional law and economical philosophy against the usurpations even of the mighty protector and his parliament. When the sole foreign connection which they maintained, that of the royal authority, was finally ruptured, Virginia stood first among the colonies not only in population, wealth and power, but in action in the order of time. As at Jamestown, on the thirtieth day of July, 1619, the House of Burgesses, representing her eleven boroughs, had constituted the first republican legislature that ever assembled in America, so at Williamsburg, that house, in 1773, originated the "correspondence system" between the colonies, which led to a general convention. And in May, 1776, the Virginia delegates to the general congress were instructed to propose a declaration that the colonies were free and independent States. In the same old capital, also, were published to the world the "declaration of rights," and the first written constitution of a commonwealth known to history—both from the pen of George Mason. (See *Southern Literary Messenger* for October, 1861, on the conflicting claims of other States to the last mentioned honor.)

The exciting cause of the Revolutionary war was the vexatious legislation of England on the subject of colonial commerce. According to Burke, the parent country had created for her own benefit a double monopoly, under which system she took all the colonial products in a raw state, and gave in exchange highly manufactured articles—the import and export trade being both exclusively in her hands. When, upon remonstrance, the existing grievances of this arrangement were aggravated by her arrogant claim to absolute control of the subject and to the entire taxing power, the crisis came and an appeal to arms was the only alternative. Daniel Webster supports this view of the reason of the revolution. (*Lost Principle*, p. 60.) But, unfortunately, the expected amelioration of commercial relations, with their reaction upon agricultural industry, were not gained, at least by Virginia and the South, as the result of their successful resistance of the foreign tyranny. It is the object of our author to prove that the Southern section was induced, by specious pretences, to transfer into the hands of the Northern majority a power similar to that formerly exercised by Great Britain; and which has, in fact, been wielded to her increased detriment, industrially and politically. Immediately after the treaty of peace with Great Britain, that power commenced a vindictive policy against the States. Her emissaries excited the savages to incursions on the frontier settlements; her agents, and even statesmen (pp. 69, 70) misrepresented the internal condition of America, and disparaged her resources; so that while England herself inau-

gured, in the language of Washington, "a war of imposts," amounting to a virtual prohibition upon our commerce, thereby effectually crippling our agricultural industry, other European nations were dissuaded from opening new receptacles to the trade thus excluded from its long-established channels. The effects of this restriction varied in the several States, according to their diversities of interest, which we must now take into consideration, but which will require a separate article.

The industrial interests of the South, and particularly of its leading State, Virginia, including her province of Kentucky, differed materially from those of the Northern States. The productions of the country in general were, at that period, few and simple, and are susceptible of easy classification. In New England, to which nature has denied the conditions of arable or pastoral agriculture, the sea, the garden, the factory, and the city have ever been the only fields open to exertion. The fisheries, including the whaling business, constituted the chief commercial pursuit of the people in that section. But, without the enjoyment of a monopoly, or the stimulant of Government bounties, that description of industry has never proved self-paying. Under the former protection of England, both these advantages had been enjoyed in sufficient measure to give a powerful impulse and support to ship-building and navigation. In connection with these, the Yankees combined the manufacture of rum and the importation of slaves. Their routine was, to exchange their summer fish in the West Indies for molasses; to manufacture this into rum; and to purchase slaves with the latter on the African coast. Again, their whale oil and dried fish found, during the colonial period, a ready market in the Mediterranean. But, on the separation from the mother country, they were deprived of their bounties and expelled from the West India market, and the protection of the British flag being withdrawn, they were also excluded from the Mediterranean by the corsairs of Barbary. During the War of the Revolution, however, that thrifty people had suffered less than others, since they availed themselves habitually, and almost openly, according to Washington, of the market afforded by the enemy's camp, for the disposal of their farm and garden produce. But, to proceed: The grain-growing interest of the middle States, in which Virginia in some degree participated, had been prostrated by the war, and, subsequently, revived only in consequence of the European demand, created by the devastations that ensued on the French revolution—for these wants operated to remove the restrictive duties previously levied upon that branch of our trade by the hostile policy of Europe. But, the agriculture of the Southern section, viz: that of rice and indigo in South Carolina; and the far more vitally important culture of tobacco, the Virginian staple, have never recovered from the disabilities imposed by foreign tariffs, because these

have been even aggravated by the sectional course of federal legislation. Every one knows that, but for an event entirely unforeseen at the time now under review, namely, the rise of the culture and manufacture of cotton, the South could never have recovered from the paralysis by which her energies were then stricken. In its degree, also, the sugar crop of Louisiana has, since the purchase of that region, contributed to sustain the section. But these providential interpositions neither did nor could enter into the calculations of our forefathers in 1787 and 1788.

The tranquillity, however, that supervened upon the peace, was not without some beneficial effects upon Virginia. Despite the disadvantages of restrictive foreign tariffs, her commerce, in a measure, was gradually reviving; while in her internal condition of satisfactory social order, she shared with her Southern sister States the blessings of the domestic organization. Thus, when in the federal convention at Philadelphia, and in the Virginia convention of the following year, the advocates of the scheme of conferring a strong and extensive authority upon the central agency urged its necessity, from the disturbed state of the population, they were refuted by drawing this distinction, and by showing that, although the disbanded soldiery of the North might have become a dangerous element in society, having then recently engaged in Shay's whiskey insurrection in Massachusetts, yet the South suffered from no such evils, nor had reason to apprehend any similar perils. There the power of the States was found amply adequate to the protection of rights and the administration of the laws. To this state of facts in the South, Washington bore testimony. (Pp. 62, 93, etc.)

In the last years of the confederation, as organized under the "articles," it became evident to every one, both at home and abroad, that a uniform system of commercial legislation was necessary to the continued existence of the States. Harassed by the vexatious and almost prohibitory imposts laid by foreign governments upon their products, the States, acting, severally, each in its isolated sovereignty, occasionally attempted retaliation. But these efforts were so misdirected by local jealousies, by considerations of temporary expediency, and by the universal ignorance of the natural laws of trade which then pervaded the whole area of commerce, that the evil was rather aggravated than remedied. Penetrated by a keen sense of this defect, and of the daily increasing ruin of industry visible to all, but accounted for only by the more sagacious, Washington recommended Virginia to negotiate a commercial league with Maryland, having for its object the joint regulation of navigation in the principal portion of Chesapeake bay and its tributaries. His correspondence also manifests the deep interest with which he viewed the pending propositions to transfer the

control of commerce to the federal agent. Commissioners were appointed by Virginia to meet those of both Maryland and Pennsylvania, in order to institute a compact; and almost at the same time, in 1786, others were also sent to Annapolis, to assist in uniting all the States in a general system of commercial policy. The single intention proposed in this appointment of a delegation was, to recommend for adoption such measures of retaliation as would force Europe to grant a system of free trade; but, under the influence of Hamilton and Madison, the Annapolis convention "was converted into an instrument for calling the federal convention, which assembled the following year at Philadelphia." (P. 87.)

Washington had displayed his foresight and practical character, by inaugurating a vast system of river and other internal improvements in his State, with a view to the ultimate command of the Western trade. His designs extended to the direct transportation of commodities from the Mississippi river to Chesapeake bay; a project yet remaining to be fully accomplished, and the manifold advantages of which were ably presented by Mr. William M. Burwell, in the February number of this Review. The lakes, also, were included in the comprehensive purpose of Washington. The adoption of the federal constitution and the election of Washington as President, severed him for ever from his State as such, and similar causes have since deprived the South, particularly, of many among her ablest men. Our author laments the failure of the first projected league above noticed, which would have left under State control the custom house as an instrument of Government, essential to self-development, to financial independence and industrial prosperity.

These enlightened intentions, however, having been overruled, the Philadelphia convention of 1787 assembled to deliberate upon the amendment of the existing compact of confederation. That some extension of the powers vested in the federal body was necessary, was almost universally acknowledged. Congress had, in May, 1785, urgently requested to be empowered to regulate the foreign trade. Every State except Rhode Island had consented. Washington had advocated a "guarded cession of such authority." Jefferson, after years of baffled diplomatic exertion to obtain from France a fair modification of her tariff. Adams, after a failure to persuade the English administration; and all other American representatives in Europe had concurred in recommending the suggestion, as the only means of compelling foreign powers to yield a just measure of reciprocity in the advantageous exchange between their manufactured articles and our raw products. Virginia had taken the initiative in the ardor of her people for free trade; but, with due caution, some of her statesmen agreed, with others of the South, in proposing to limit the grant of

power to a period of twenty-five years, with conditions of renewal. Under such circumstances did the federal convention, composed of experienced men, most of whom had occupied positions of public trust from the commencement of the revolution, enter upon its duties on the 25th of May, 1787.

The second chapter of the work under notice is devoted to a vivid, concise, judicious, and highly interesting summary of the debates which occurred in that body, principally on the question of representation. But our limits forbid us to indulge in any detailed reference. Had the convention confined its action to the amendment of the articles of confederation in those points wherein they were confessedly defective, and to the insertion of a provision for the uniform regulation of commerce, its labors would have been easy and brief, its proceedings harmonious, and its result probably satisfactory. In the Virginia State convention, called the ensuing year for the ratification of the constitution, the first objection raised was that her delegates to Philadelphia had exceeded their commissions—having been appointed to amend, not to abolish, the former confederate agency. Even previously to the Philadelphia assemblage, the prophetic patriotism of Patrick Henry had induced him to decline an appointment as delegate to that body; which is, perhaps, much to be regretted, as his wisdom, caution and powerful influence, might have prevented the introduction of those dangerous and now fatal provisions which he subsequently ineffectually opposed in his State.

At an early period, however, of the deliberation, it was agreed that the articles of confederation were hopelessly defective, and that a new organization should be effected. As a matter of course, therefore, the question of distribution of legislative power among the parties interested at once superseded every other, as a preliminary issue of paramount importance. A very general impression has in latter years prevailed, that these "parties in interest" were simply the several States; but it is the object of our author to establish the fact, fully recognized in the convention itself, that the sectional line of interest between North and South was already well defined, and especially that it was the design of the convention to create in the Federal Government a "sectional equilibrium" of powers, giving to each section a control or effective check upon the action of the central body, on the principle of equity, i. e., of equality—that by the adoption of an anomalous and cumbersome machinery they failed to accomplish this purpose—that the "PRINCIPLE" was "Lost," and that the consequences to the Southern section have been most disastrous. And it is because we are deeply impressed with the correctness of the author's general views upon this subject—because, now that our Southern States have at length shaken off the federal incubus, they are called on to adjust Confederate relations, not only

between themselves, but possibly between new or future sectional interests—that we have judged it worth while to study and to review this book, recommending it to our public as a work that might, in a more perfect edition, enriched with a judicious analysis, take position as a standard text book of reference in regard to the elements of constitutional legislation.

The means of effecting this just purpose of “equilibrium” were sought in fixing the basis of federal representation; and in debate upon that primary matter, the positions of States and of the sections became fully ascertained. We quote:

“It will be remembered that whilst the federal convention was employed in the perplexing task of organizing the legislative department, four distinct interests aspired to its control: 1. The small States, on the ground that an equality of representation was necessary to defend them from encroachments from the large States. 2. The large and populous States, because it was just, they contended, that political influence should be measured by riches, extent and population. 3. The freesoil; and, 4. The slaveholding interests. It was a struggle for power, and each interest strove for its possession.” (Page 117.)

In order to adjust the conflicting claims of these interests, the convention discussed the basis of representation. The extreme view of the freesoil party was embodied in a proposition introduced by Alexander Hamilton, of New York, to apportion representatives according to the number of free white inhabitants alone; this was offered as an amendment to a resolution of Governor Randolph, of Virginia, which occupied a medium ground, viz: that the federal legislature should, from time to time, regulate the apportionment on the basis of the quota of contributions to the federal treasury, and upon that of the free population, as they might judge best in different cases. This double and self-inconsistent proposal, which remitted to congress the immense power in question, was distasteful to all. The extreme view of the slaveholding interest was presented in a resolution by Mr. Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, to the effect that representation should be proportioned to the entire gross population. It is observable that, while the first-mentioned rule would have vested the federal power in the North, the last would equally have yielded it to the South. But in order to obtain an “equilibrium,” it was agreed—after several conferences in committees, and after a proposition to make a mixed basis of wealth and population had been voted down—to fix the representation in the larger, lower, and more popularly elected branch of the legislature, on the basis which, for taxation purposes, had some years previously been adopted, viz: that of population, five slaves being counted as three free persons. This arbitrary, artificial and unfounded reckoning would, it was thought, effect the desired end of placing the sections on an equality in power. It was submitted to by some Southern delegates in the expectation

that the tendency of emigration, at that time strongly directed toward the Southern unoccupied districts, would very shortly correct the slight, and, as it was believed, temporary inequality of representation thereby conceded in favor of the North. With this view, the leaders of the South insisted on an early census, and a readjustment of the conjectural representative quota decreed for the first congress. It is superfluous to add, that these fond expectations were disappointed; that the generously imprudent confidence reposed in the North was betrayed, and that their majority, immediately on the institution of the Government, proceeded consistently to use their power in legislating for their own sectional aggrandizement, in neutralizing the previous inducements to emigration toward the South, in destroying her commerce, and rendering all her industry tributary to the cupidity and profit of unprincipled Northern speculation in land, in labor, and in money.

Mr. Madison attempted to extend the same basis of representation thus fixed, to the Senate; but, as the small States had insisted, at first, on an equality in both branches, and as the Northern delegates dreaded the ultimate effect of such a ratio of suffrage, founded on population, since all admitted the probability of the South soon becoming the more populous section; therefore, under the lead of Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, they united with New Jersey and Delaware in adopting the principle of State equality in the organization of the upper branch. (Pp. 116-119.)

In the Virginia convention of 1788, to which our author devotes a large portion of chapter IV, the new scheme of government met with able and consistent opposition. Its chief advocates were Madison, Randolph, John Marshall, George Nicholas and Edmund Pendleton. Its principal opponents were Henry, Mason, Grayson and Monroe. The synopsis of argument given in the work requires, and will well repay a most attentive perusal. The powers of taxation, of the regulation of trade and navigation, of finance and of military authority, were fully discussed in all their relations to the security of civil liberty, but most particularly with regard to the perils which were believed to menace the essential principle of the sectional equality. At the commencement of the session, it is proven by accurate calculations that a majority of delegates were opposed to ratification; but, by the use of illegitimate influences, a small number were perverted to its support, and it eventually passed by a majority of eight votes. Meantime, the popular sentiment and opinion of the State are shown to have been strongly in opposition; and it was only on account of a most unjust, anomalous and oligarchical system of suffrage and representation, whereby every county, irrespective of population, enjoyed an equal representation, that a measure so unpopular could have been carried. The author furnishes tables,

prepared by Jefferson, which exhibit the fact that, under this plan, less than two-fifths of the citizens, namely, those resident in the counties between the falls of the rivers and the bay, possessed an absolute control over the State in all the departments of its government. (P. 106.)

The ratification by Virginia as the ninth State, breathed life into the constitution. Pursuant to conditions precedent, without which that instrument could never have been adopted, the State legislature immediately proposed several amendments of the most fundamental character. Feebly advocated by her congressional representatives, her remonstrances were disregarded, and, as predicted, a persistent course of legislation hostile to Southern interests was begun, and has been continued even to its culmination in the year 1861, when our long endurance has been terminated by a disruption of the grievous bond then knitted.

It has been shown, then, that the irrefragable statement of facts and cogent arguments presented by our author, coinciding in his conclusions drawn from the sad, historical experience of his State and section, with the melancholy anticipations formerly suggested to the penetration of Henry and his patriotic colleagues in opposition to the constitution, are not such as to afford any ground of sympathy with those Southern men who have superstitiously venerated that compact, or who now mourn with sentimental fancy over its repeal. That it was a sacrifice of the rights and interests of the South in its origin, and that its results have been not less pernicious than was then expected, is the doctrine held, and maintained with convincing ability in this work. In part II, the methods adopted by the dominant section to perpetuate its possession of power are briefly but lucidly recapitulated as follows:

"It was said that representation being, in its nature, a fundamental article, ought to be fixed in the constitution—that it was the constitution itself. Nevertheless, congress has controlled the whole matter; for it has, by direct and indirect action, assumed jurisdiction to regulate the tides of population.

"The whole system of federal policy has been designed with that end in view; but the principal instruments by which that consequence was brought about, are: First. The protective system. Second. The exclusion of slavery from the territories. Third. The refusal to protect the agriculture of the South. Fourth. The interdiction of the slave-trade, without laying a similar disability upon emigration; but, instead, holding out to it high and unusual encouragements. Fifth. The use of the credits of the Federal Government. For none of which is there the slightest warrant in the constitution." (Pp. 194, 195.)

We cannot follow the writer through his proofs upon these specifications, but the reader will find them unanswerable. Taking the first and third of them together, he shows clearly that the substitution of a protection for manufactures, even as incidental to revenue, had never entered the minds of the

framers of the constitution; while its extension beyond that point, which has been coupled in practice with the most flagitious audacity, was a departure from original principles utterly unconceived by the statesmen of that primitive age. On the contrary, they contemplated the precisely opposite policy of liberating commerce from restraint, and thereby effectually encouraging the agricultural interest by such retaliatory impositions upon foreign productions as should force the concession of free trade. But, for want of this, the property of Virginia in particular has been depreciated and her soil depopulated, while her sister States of the South have been preserved from a similar fate only by the unexpected diversion of their industry into totally new channels of production.

In part III: "How the Principle of Sectional Equilibrium May be Restored," the author clearly intimates his conviction that a restoration, within the old Union, of the constitutional principle in favor of the South was, at the time he wrote, an almost hopeless impossibility. It would have involved, first, a complete sacrifice of the prejudices on behalf of their own separate interests, in which the whole generation of the Northern population had been educated; then, a thorough and radical amendment of the constitution, to be conceded by the majority on the mere consideration of impartial justice; also, a consequent entire alteration and reversal of the policy and legislation of the general Government upon those very matters of finance, commerce, extension of limits, and patronage which, while cautiously treated, one by one, have yet, periodically, convulsed the nation, and which mere State sovereignty has been so powerless to control equitably; and had all these impossibilities been effected, there would still remain no means of restitution to the South for the seventy years of injury and oppression she has endured. He arrives, therefore, at the obvious conclusion, that a separation, speedy, thorough and final, from the hostile element, was inevitable. Then, looking into the future, he suggests that a new confederation might be formed between the Southern section and the Western agricultural States (p. 225). But, in our judgment, he attributes to the freesoil people of the Northwest a greater degree of conservative and of just feeling than they are entitled to be credited with; and it is quite probable that the developments which have occurred since his publication may now have modified his opinion in that respect. He shows, indeed, from historical instances, citing especially the permanence of the Swiss Confederacy, that a diversity of interests and sentiments, even upon the most important points, as those of religion, or of social organization, need not become causes of disruption, but are rather elements of union and prosperity, provided that their free development and reciprocal action is preserved, by the establishment of a perfect equilibrium of power, in a mutual veto on

legislation. And it is, perhaps, conceivable that at some period we may safely and beneficially enter into some commercial relations with those States whose natural outlet is the Mississippi river.

But the great lesson to be derived from the study of the past, of the errors of our fathers in their formation of the constitution, and of the wicked constructions by which that instrument, faulty as it was, has been wrested even far beyond its true powers for our injury, consists in the application of these experiences to our own immediate future. Had the delegates of States in 1787 contented themselves with a moderate extension of the powers granted to the federal agent, retaining the equality of States already recognized in the Confederacy; confirming to each State her control of the taxes, instead of creating a vast and irresponsible money power; had they superadded to the State rights in congress the great principle of sectional equality, by the simple method of an absolute veto on each part, the late Union might have been indefinitely permanent. But as it never served the purpose of its design, as it could not but have fallen after its gradual but utter failure was consummated, its loss to the North is but the gain and the opportunity of the South. Let our people, then, beware of similar mistakes; let them avoid especially the institution of a great central money power, carefully discriminating between the range of authority necessary to conduct a war, and the limitations essential to liberty in time of peace; let the States raise their heads into the upper atmosphere, and in the prosperity that must soon ensue, let them exhibit their own sovereignty at home, by such a development of their vast resources as will call for the local services, in every department of government, of their own best citizens, men such as have hitherto been "swallowed up in the insatiable federal vortex;" and, above all, should distinct sectional interests hereafter exhibit themselves, arising perhaps from the progress of varieties of agriculture, of navigation, commerce and manufactures, let such interests, well defined, be entrusted in the central agency, with the necessary preservative check of a negative voice or veto upon legislation; for, according to Calhoun, it is this negative power which is the formative principle of a constitution, while the positive power provides for the routine process of government. And, we may add, it is this veto power alone that can protect minorities, whose interests always most require protection.

ART. VI.—THE LOYALTY OF THE BORDER STATES.

“We must not be deceived by words :
 We must not take them, as unheeding hands
 Receive base money, at the current worth,
 But with a just suspicion try their sound,
 And in the even balance weigh them well.”—SOUTHEY.

“Language was given to conceal thought,” says Talleyrand. Politics and diplomacy was his *trade*, and he was a proficient in his business. The *science* of diplomacy and politics has no conflict with the moral law. The *trade* confounds all distinctions of right and wrong, and sanctifies all means conducing to its end. The aphorism we have quoted is worthy of its paternity, redolent as it is far more with the fragrance of the shop of the charlatan than the closet of the philosopher.

The *suppressio veri* is not, however, always equivalent to the *suggestio falsi*. You have no right to “pump” out of me my opinion of neighbor Brown, and if you do attempt indirectly to obtain it from me, I may, with all propriety, evade the ill-concealed search of your conversation (I say, of your conversation, for you are a poor hand at cross-examining a friend in the unsuspecting confidence of social intercourse, if you have to resort to questions). It is my misfortune, however, to be a little suspicious, and I have reason to be suspicious of you. I have not forgotten the difficulty in which I was wellnigh involved a few months since with a very valued friend, by your report of a remark I made at my own fireside, innocent enough, when I had the opportunity to explain, but questionable enough, as repeated, to alienate a less confiding friend. I violate no moral obligation in replying to your eulogies upon Mr. Brown, by assenting to what you say of his virtues as a husband and a father, and conceding to him the possession of all those homely attributes which even the instinct of a brute manifests in the meanest of God’s creatures. I may truthfully do that, for I believe he does love his wife and children as devotedly as a purely selfish man can love anything which he may congratulate himself upon being able to claim as exclusively his own. There is no moral obligation on me to gratify your impertinent curiosity, by expressing any opinion as to the benevolence of his conduct to that poor widow in the valley, whose dead husband had rented of him their humble home. He had a legal right to levy a distress warrant upon her bed and bedding, and in his settlement with the sheriff he was sufficiently particular to exclude the imputation of exacting one cent beyond his lawful dues. But I need not tell you in how much I thought it inconsistent with the most ordinary of human feelings, to intrude upon the sorrow of a lone widow in the first hours of her deep distress, and for such a purpose. An afflictive Providence had forced her to expend every cent of her scanty earn-

ings to ease the dying hours and do decent respect to the lifeless remains of a husband, and left her absolutely nothing with which to satisfy the "dun" of her landlord. Neighbor Brown knew this as well as you and I, but it was no legal satisfaction of his demand—no sufficient defence to his warrant; and if you choose, *you* may visit her calamities upon the law with the harshness and promptitude of its remedy. I will not. But I am, nevertheless, not obliged to tell you what I think of a Shylock landlord; nor need I tell you how regardful of the law I knew this same neighbor of mine to be, when, six months ago, he shaved young Smith at the rate of twenty per cent. to enable him to pay a gambling debt, without informing his father of his vices; nor even of the more recent transaction with myself, in which he abused the confidence I foolishly reposed in his word, by swindling me in a horse trade. I deserved that, however, for I ought to have known him better. I did know him better, for his money never blinded me. I only miscalculated his estimate of the obligations imposed by a social position to which his moral worth is entirely unequal.

Far be it from me to say that the suppression of truth is never equivalent to actual falsehood. It is a lie. It is the most malicious of all lies, when words are carefully and studiously selected, so as to express nothing that is not true; but, by the suppression of material facts, and the aid of appropriate gesture and emphasis, to suggest the falsehood. The adroit slanderer always "damns" his victim "with faint praise." Open censure and avowed hostility may discredit the testimony he bears. But to praise, and yet omit in eulogy the recital of any thing to justify the applause, is a master stroke of invidious spleen. The notion of a transmigration of souls seems to be predicated upon the theory that the animal creation furnishes some appropriate receptacle for every human soul. If so, we imagine the ichneumon would be the only contestant for the little soul of the professional slanderer. It is said to be the business of his life to destroy the eggs of a vastly superior animal—the crocodile—and that not to feast on them, for he never eats one. It is the elected employment of the slanderer to crush every egg laid by industry and integrity, so as effectually to destroy all the brood which his superiors in merit might naturally anticipate. He may, he does succeed in "breaking to the hope" of many a better man, his future. But it requires no great exercise of faith on the part of the wise, to believe that the God who gives life in one form may give it in another. It has been said of our own Washington, that Providence left him childless, that a nation might call him Father; and who, of earthly parents, from that bourne whither we are all tending, looks down upon as numerous and extended a family of offspring as the childless apostle of the Gentiles.

We are not bound at all times, under all circumstances, and to all persons, to tell all we know, or to say all we think.

If thou wishest to be wise,
Keep these words before thine eyes:
What thou speakest, and how, beware,
Of whom, to whom, and when and where.

But we may never say to another that from which we intend him to understand us as asserting a lie. We may evade—we may refuse to answer; but if we answer, we must not lie. If you tell me that to evade or to refuse to answer, is virtually to disclose what you would conceal, I have only to say—be it so. Your conscience is clear. Do your duty and leave consequences and inferences to Him who is abundantly able to vindicate the beneficence and the majesty of His own requirements. He who would ask you such a question would listen at the key-hole to a private conversation, or break a seal to read the contents of a confidential communication. But lost though he be to all sense of decency, virtue is not so defenceless as he imagines. It has been said that locks were only effective in keeping out honest men, and this idea would have truth only effective in preserving the sanctity of confidence from decent people. The one idea is as correct as the other. In spite of all your prudence, burglars will sometimes break into your money-drawer, and, in spite of all your reticence, inquisitors will sometimes pry into the secrets of your bosom. But you keep the moral as much at a distance as the legal felon. Admit him as little to your confidence, and you will have no more reason to dread intrusion from him than the other. You may well fear him though, if he be, as there is only too great a probability he may be, beside you now.

It has been frequently urged, as an objection to democratic institutions, that the effect of them was naturally and irresistibly to suppress manliness and independence of thought. It must be confessed that there is not a little force and pertinence in the idea. Brief official terms and tenures of office dependant upon continued popular favor, tempt strongly the virtue of political aspirants. But the temptation and, alas! the seduction, does not always stop with this class. The judiciary, if not, as is too apt to be the case, directly elected by the people, and that too for limited terms, is the creature of an executive or legislature, which is itself a reflection of the latest popular caprice. Few men of intelligence and education—aye, in spite of professions to the contrary, very few—are entirely destitute of aspirations for judicial or political promotion. Offices of trust and honor are the natural rewards of individual merit; and while many shrink from the responsibility of holding or the struggle to secure them, the distinction incident to their incumbency is grateful to all. But the absence of a permanently wealthy class of society renders almost every one in the

community, without any aspirings, to a greater or less extent, dependant even for bread upon popular favor. The learned professions feel the baneful influence we are considering to a lamentable extent; and the demagogue lawyer and electioneering doctor are as frequent spectacles as the trading politician. Indeed, we have seen more of disgusting truckling to popular prejudices and follies, in aspirants for professional employment, than we have ever witnessed upon the hustings or court-green from cross-road politicians or embryo statesmen. Again, in popular Governments the police are of, and sympathize with the masses; subordinates are too often recruited from the ranks of the lawless, and high officials are dependant for honor and power upon the denizens of groggeries, the decoys of gambling hells and the bullies of brothels. With such ministers of the law, the actual danger of outrage and violence from an excited mob is no slight matter, and with men of large possessions or exposed property the imagined danger is much greater. No wonder, therefore, that, upon exciting topics, the *suppressio veri* should be common enough among those who possess no satisfactory guarantee of the sympathy of the mob with their views. The demagogue will always resort to it when his interest may be promoted, and even good men are apt to claim an unreasonable extension of the privilege of silence. Few men are bold enough to face a mob, and it is not always wise even in those few to manifest that courage. In times of great popular excitement, that portion of the community which does not sympathize with the current prefer, and, judiciously enough, very often, to remain quiet, if possible, and avoid the wrath where they may not claim the approval of the populace. The freedom of speech and the press may nominally exist; but that only means that under the forms of law discussion may not be suppressed. What need though of forms of law to enforce conformity to, or at least silent acquiescence in the will of the mass, when the officers of the law are but creatures of the mob and exponents of its fury—when the mob and its creatures make their caprice a law unto themselves—magnify difference of opinion into enormity of crime—prescribe penalties unknown to civilization and abhorrent to humanity—and execute sentence upon an obnoxious individual without notice, trial or judgment. At such a time it is idle to imagine that the press or the rostrum will give expression to that variety of opinion which free thought engenders in every community of thinking men. Public speakers and public writers only manifest that variety by a silence, pregnant of dissent, from the passionate outburst of the hour.

The great sea of public opinion presents for the time a surface unruffled by the breath of controversy. But the dead level is only apparent. The bed of old ocean itself is indented with mountain and valley, with hillock and vale; and, beneath the

calm surface of this summer sea, there slumber elements of discord which await only one favoring breeze to lash its placid waters into foam and dash its angry waves mountain high.

You may be sure that in a moment of such excitement everything said or written will, to a certain extent, harmonize with the popular passion. Language then is studiously employed; it may be even by a majority of the community, rather to conceal than express thoughts. We care less to know what representative men do and say, than what they do not and say; but information can best be gathered by noting the care with which they avoid collision with the utterances of the recognized spokesmen of the mob. If an accordance of sentiment be expressed in halting or hesitating language—if there be but partial acquiescence in their fulminations of wrath—and, especially, if the applause of the idol of the hour be faint in its emphasis, you may be sure that the heart of the writer or speaker is revolting against the tyranny, and merely nursing its wrath and gathering its strength for the anticipated hour of retribution.

You say you would not act thus—that it is a cowardly part. My friend, you have never been placed under such circumstances. I am free enough to concede to you all commendable courage; but I have never regarded it as especially wise or brave to beat ones head against a stone wall, or even to invite the wrath of an enraged bull. Indeed, I imagine that you might very well, without loss of character for manhood, step aside to avoid passing beneath a shaking wall; or even at the sacrifice of a little dignity and steadiness of pace, place a pretty high fence between yourself and an infuriate beast.

How far these considerations ought to modify our estimate of the apparent unanimity of the Northern people in their feigned hostility to us, we have no means of accurately determining, being sure, however we are, that there is a quiet sentiment of antagonism to this war pervading a portion—it may be a considerable portion—of their thinking men, which will sooner or later make itself felt in the councils of the United States. A worse than Oriental despotism suppresses now all manifestation of displeasure with the action of Government; but it cannot be always so. The universal Yankee nation bends, apparently with unbroken unanimity, at the shrine of Moloch, and clamors with demoniac fury for blood. But not all. Amid the apostacy of the ancient Jews, the heart of the stricken prophet, lamenting that he alone was left in all Israel to maintain the service of his Lord, was gladdened and relieved by the divine assurance that there were yet left seven thousand who had not bent the knee to Baal. And amid the apparently universal defection of the whilom conservatives of the North, there are even now occasional indications, which may not be mistaken, of a no less numerous band "faithful among the faithless still."

But we are far more interested to know the extent of the influence of these considerations in the border slave States: how much of toryism is apparent only, and how much is real and formidable. We would fain hope that the actual active toryism is small indeed, and that even in Kentucky, humiliating as is the attitude she has elected, it pervades to a very limited extent the body of the community. Circumstances have been very unpropitious for the development and exhibition of our true strength along the border, and a faithless foe has availed himself of every opportunity to pervert and misrepresent public sentiment. Time only can fully determine the extent of the real defection from the cause of the South; but we are satisfied that it is vastly more apparent than real. Heretofore, the Southern sentiment has been paralyzed by the presence of an overwhelming hostile force, disarming the community and intimidating even the boldest by threatening the purity of their women and the safety of their children. But the day and hour of retribution is at hand, and when it does come, woe, woe to the Crittendens and Hickses, the Gambles and Carliles, who have sought to abuse the misplaced confidence of a gallant people by selling their birthright for a mess of pottage. Many of their victims, apparently the most acquiescent, are even now amid the despotism which surrounds them—

“Knitting their brows for the gathering storm,
And nursing their wrath to keep it warm.”

Give rein to the enthusiasm of our soldiery and allow them to assume an advance movement, and ere many weeks the insignia of the Confederacy will flaunt in the breezes of heaven upon the uttermost verge of slave territory. Many unexpected voices will unite in swelling the loud acclaim of welcome to the advancing standards; and many hearts we have believed were beating now responsive to the war cry of the invader, will bound and leap with exultant joy. Around the newly-erected altars of the true faith thousands upon thousands of loyal Southern men will promptly gather. They who amid the apostacy around them have maintained their faith untainted, and though persistently refusing to bend the knee to Baal, have escaped the clutches of tyranny, will gladly greet the patriot refugees returning under the protection of their country's flag to once happy but now desolated homes. And full many a penitent who, under the stringency of a temptation, the power of which we little appreciate, has, in some unguarded hour, forsworn his country and plighted allegiance to the foe, will gather with them around the altar of patriotism; and, in attestation of the sincerity of his repentance and the extent of his loyalty, with musket upon his shoulder, will assume his position in the ranks, pledging to the independence and the honor of his country the best faculties of his head, the best energies of his body, the warmest affections, and, if need be,

the best blood of his heart. Give to the loyal men of the border arms and munitions of war, give them material aid to repel the intervention of the invader, and we believe they can and they will crush out the pestilent toryism now daily growing into more formidable proportions under the shadow of federal power.

We are not resident upon or refugee from the border, and have no personal interest in vindicating its people from the too indiscriminate censure to which they are subjected. We slumber in peace and quietude under the shadow of the Confederate capitol, in the bosom of the same unanimously loyal people who constitute the elected body-guard of the executive. Patriotism among such a people costs very little. But when we meet in our everyday walk gray-haired men and dependent women, driven into exile from home and its comforts to escape the oppression and pollution of an insolent invader, we are forcibly reminded of the heavy burthens it imposes elsewhere. We are interested to vindicate every portion of our people from the stigma of toryism, and we prefer to believe, when we may, that every section of the Confederacy is true and loyal. We are not willing to concede, and we know of no facts which demand, the concession that any considerable portion of our people still prefer the arbitrary and despotic rule of Lincoln and Seward, to the mild and gentle sway of law and order, which distinguishes the wise and pure administration of our infant Confederacy. We would not fear a fair test of the will of the people of any county south of Mason and Dixon's line between Jefferson Davis and Abraham Lincoln—between the infant Confederacy and the decrepid Union.

ART. VII.—AGRICULTURAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE SOUTH.*

When Herodotus visited Egypt, Babylon had gone out, and Nineveh was being rebuilt upon old Nineveh, which had been buried in the accumulated dust of ages. The foundations were massive and deep laid, and no art known to the time was spared. "Babylon the great became the habitation of devils, is fallen, and shall be known no more at all." Babylon and Nineveh, and innumerable other cities have disappeared and are forgotten. The corner stone was wanting.

*Address delivered before the Agricultural Society of Pendleton, South Carolina, November 2d, 1861, by Hon. Z. G. Clemson, LL.D., Grand Officer of the Order of Leopold. Late Superintendent of the Agricultural Office of the United States. (Manuscript copy furnished by the Society, with request that it be published in *De Bow's Review*.)

In vain "did Solomon obtain cedar and fir from the King of Tyre, and bring great stones, costly stones, and hewed stones, refined artists, cunning, and endowed with understanding to work in gold, silver, brass, iron, stone, etc. Of workmen three score and ten thousand were bearers of burdens, and four score thousand were hewers in the mountains, and three thousand and six hundred were overseers to the workmen, and the house was covered with the gold of Ophir." The temple has passed away, there is nothing left to tell us where it stood. Yet Solomon passed all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom. The corner stone was wanting.

These reflections arose in contemplating the massive, unfinished structure in Columbia. Its foundations are of old rock, its façades as enduring as its foundations, and the highest talent employed to shape and ornament the marble brought from Italy. We would not suppress the ever-rising question, how long will it last? to show the absence of the corner stone. For the Word says: "They shall eat their bread with carefulness, and drink their water with astonishment, that her land may be desolate from all that is therein, because of the violence of them that dwell therein. And the cities that are inhabited shall be laid waste, and the land shall be desolate, and ye shall know that I am the Lord."*

All history teaches that man, individually and in the concrete, is governed and entirely dependent upon the soil for existence. For it is written: "All flesh is grass." Nations are powerful or weak, prosperous or wretched, short-lived or enduring as the power vested in the soil is understood and used. That knowledge is the power of powers on earth, the corner stone of all civilization. The density or sparseness of population is dependent upon it. All wars are successful according as the armies are fed. The power of steam is as nothing when compared to that inherent to meat or bread; for many powers, if properly invoked, may influence the universe. In looking back through the vista of time, we remark the gradual decay of nations; as the soil was impoverished, population became more and more sparse, wretchedness and misery prevailed until entire extinction finally supervened, leaving edifices to totter, fall, disintegrate and decay. The pyramids of Egypt and monuments of Luxor alone stand to proclaim this is the land that overflowed with milk and with honey. Who has visited the land where civilization was cradled, and not been shocked at the present condition of the human race? Fallen from its high estate, it crumbled as the earth was degraded. We are passing through the divers phases so often trodden and as often forgotten. It is, however, a matter somewhat singular that, at the present period of the world's history, when science has

* Ezekiel, chap. xii.

reached an ascending point never before attained, the enlightened have not bent their energies to direct and stop the rapid downward march which must, if continued, eventuate, with unerring certainty, in wretchedness and depopulation. It is the more strange because our population is as fine as the world has seen; endowed with high qualities of head and heart. They are born with all that is admirable, morally and physically. In searching for the causes of improvidence, we have been led to believe that there is something radically wrong in the system of education heretofore pursued, exclusive of the one thing needful so far as our existence on this earth is considered and the health of ourselves as a nation. To us, it is manifest to overflowing that, without a change in that system, which must be broad and deep, there is no help for us, collectively or individually. We have those feelings intuitive to the race. We love to dwell upon the fond remembrances of our forefathers, and we look back to the old homestead, where our fond parents smiled and taught, with a love and respect amounting to veneration. We cling to the hope centred in our children, and fondly cherish the anticipation that they will live to perpetuate what we have labored to establish. Yet, scarce an effort is made to arrest that current that sweeps all that is dear upon earth in the direction of uncertainty, at best rugged, and not unfrequently leading to premature death.

We do not undervalue the benefits derived from the classics. But that dispensation would appear to have run its time and produced its effects. With the advance of science, civilization, within certain latitudes, loudly calls for other things as indispensable to the age in which we live. The revolution which is upon us has all the symptoms of a struggle for existence from which we cannot escape, and which must be met, for the end is not with the clash of arms. The teachings which have obtained and still prevail in our midst, have produced some admirable results with corresponding disadvantages, which may never be entirely eradicated in the brief time allotted to our generation. Every man who has received what we call a classical education, becomes a hero in his own estimation. He imagines himself born to govern; the intensity of thought of all similarly educated during his time, takes a like direction. Each crammed with a few stereotyped ideas and phrases, with constitutional modifications enters upon the field of life. His constitution is vigorous, he is well fed, and goes forth to battle with his stock in trade. In the conflict which is upon us we are paying for the want of schooling. May we not have to mourn our own Balaklava charges, as we deplore the absence of that knowledge essential on the farm as on the battle-field. That torch which lights the labyrinths of practice and inspires the patriot and brave with confidence that always leads to victory. That knowledge is not born with us, but effulgent in the corner stone.

We are essentially and above all things an agricultural people. If we have consideration among nations, it is because we have natural endowments which enable us, for the time being, to produce fruits of the earth which have become a necessity. There are other crops perhaps as much so as the great staple, which we do not cultivate, and which might give us increased power. Unfortunately, we have, in common with the Cromwells of the North, a disposition to the excessive use of adjectives, and are given to self-glorification. We admit that our land has been greatly blessed, and that our cotton crop is of paramount importance to commerce; but that may not be so always, for the very conflict in which we are engaged, and in which cotton plays so potent a part, may inaugurate or stimulate to greater activity in the production of cotton elsewhere. It may not be known to all of you that the cotton plant is a native of Abyssinia, and, at nine thousand feet elevation, a staple is grown as long and as fine as that grown on our sea islands. If we can credit Livingston and other travellers, a vast portion of Africa is eminently fit for the culture of the gossypium. The soil is fertile, besides having a remarkable climate, similarly to our own cotton region. But, admitting the fact that neither South America, Africa or India is capable to compete with the cotton latitudes of the Southern States, either science and history are unreliable, or the time is fast approaching when the cultivation of cotton must cease upon the uplands in the Southern Confederacy. The marl formations may form an exception. Indeed, without an entire and radical change, not only the cotton will cease to be cultivated, but the lands will have to be abandoned altogether, and the capital at Columbia will stand a monument in a solitary waste.

Fertility is the nation's hope for continued existence; land is as nothing without it is productive, nor does production depend upon culture, as how the land is cultivated, for sterility is not a consequence of use but of abuse. In the absence of all restraint, and in the presence of a public domain, rich with the accumulated gifts of untold time, offered at a nominal cost, the public weal is sacrificed to cupidity and ignorance, a legalized invitation to ruin and destroy. The lands belong to the nation, and without fertility is maintained the nation ceases to exist, because there can be no population without production. The time was when agriculture was mere empiricism, and the soil regarded as a bank to be drawn upon until depletion. Hence the march of civilization from east to west. It is only within the last quarter of a century that scientists have turned their attention to investigations connected with the constitution and the functions of the soil. From that period science assumed command. With the progressive increase of population, science has become a necessity; there is no help for us out of it, as we do not form an exception to those laws which goy-

ern the world; without it no nation can endure. History tells a truthful tale, and our structure must fall and disappear without a corner stone.

The constitution of the United States contained no provision by which that basis of all prosperity, and even existence, could be brought under the egide of the laws. That was not because its importance was ignored, but because the subject itself, at the period of our revolution, was an occult chapter, and upon which there was no philosophy, till the vague feeling attached to its importance, and the nascent anxiety felt by other nations upon the subject, caused Washington and others to feel that something was necessary; hence their efforts in that direction. Under a pressure arising from the example of other older nations and the state of science throughout the world, the agricultural division of the United States patent office arose. At first a mere clerkship, by degrees it became a spurious department without law or constitutional resting-place, and took root in the patent-office, where it was sustained by an annual appropriation for the purchase and gratuitous distribution of seed, together with the annual publication of a report on agricultural subjects. Members of Congress found it a useful implement through which they ingratiated themselves with their constituents. With few exceptions, the object of members was attained when the packages went forth bearing their respective names. Notwithstanding the worst of management, the department was instrumental in great good; under proper control it would have become an ornament to the capital, of great public utility, and an object of interest to the civilized world. It was popular with the North and unpopular with many Southern members; strict constructionists could not vote for its support; States rights men looked upon it with jealousy. Had it been managed with ability and the revolution been stayed, the agricultural department of the Government would have become a power for good behind the throne greater than the throne, and that in the face of all opposition. By it and through its instrumentality, patriots hoped that the great agricultural interests of the country would have become united, and thus broken down, or presented a barrier to both and all corrupt parties of all sections. Had it been cared for and directed by the South, it would have become a most useful and beneficent institution, of vastly greater import than any other department of the Government, owing to its unison with the spirit, and the occupation of its people.

Strange as it is, the constitution of the Confederate States takes no cognizance of the subject in any manner. We are emphatically an agricultural people; the great conservative institution of the country, for which we are pouring out our blood, depends upon it; it is the basis upon which our political structure is formed, and upon which we depend for our individ-

ual and political existence. Of all the departments of the Government, the most useful, the most essential, that which would command all others and should receive the first and most earnest attention, has been entirely ignored, and leaves the basis of our prosperity and existence to the care of overseers and negroes, the one as knowing and as careless as the other. This is comment sufficient upon the capabilities or acquirements of our legislators. It shows the most gross and unpardonable ignorance upon the state of the world, and is conclusive evidence that our political structure requires a corner stone.

We educate our children, who should become agriculturists, neglecting those branches of knowledge which should be their occupation through life, from which they and their families are to gain subsistence, and upon which the very existence of the nation depends. There is not to be found in the Southern Confederacy one single institution of learning worthy of respect, where a scientific education can be acquired to fit one for the comprehensive and all-important profession of agriculture. We pride ourselves upon our agricultural resources. Each plantation should be, if it is not a kingdom self-supporting, requiring the aid of all the sciences; yet the only thing which is understood, and which would appear to be the object of our race, is exhaustion of land to entire sterility—in other words, the demolition and removal of the underpinning of the structure in which we live. Knowledge upon the subject is so deplorably wanting, that there does not appear to be a single member of the Confederate congress who realizes the importance of the subject, our condition as a people, or the requirements of the age. A feeble attempt was made to ingraft an agricultural, illy-defined something upon the patent office of the Confederate States. We may congratulate ourselves upon its failure; the projectors did not rise to the importance of the subject. Such an incongruous alliance would be a fatal blow to the hopes of the patriot. The connection of an agricultural department with or under the control of the patent office, would give vitality to the latter, and thus prolong the life of an institution which is as absurd and useless as its prototype, upon the model of which it was founded. It is in reality an incubus upon the inventive genius of man. The patent-office as it is, forces the inventor to the expense and trouble of taking out a patent which secures him nothing, but, on the contrary, turns him over to ruinous litigation, and in a limited period sequesters his property to public use. As it stands, it is a public nuisance, and requires abatement. Such connection would be an endless cause for debate, injurious to the first great cause which we advocate, and another fruitful source of speculation and fraud, and a reprehensible, ill-judged increase of demagogical patronage.

An agricultural department should first and foremost have a

resting-place in the constitution. It should be free from all influences other than the agricultural interests. It should have no connection with parties of any description, and secured independent of their baneful and blighting influence. Believing, as we do, with the recent history of the United States before us, that section II of article II of the Confederate constitution contains the fruitful germ of destruction, we would have it independent, if possible, of the executive, and rather a check upon those powers.

We should be opposed to any creation, if organized as other departments are, and have been, mere rewards to politicians, demagogues and other deleterious fungi. Our experience under the constitution of the United States, not less than under that of the Confederate States, is pregnant with wisdom. Our national existence does not date twelve months, yet it is cried from the house-tops, the press proclaims it, that the pressure for office in Richmond is overwhelming. Patriotic aspirants for office block the avenues to high places; they even enter the sanctuaries, and the question is asked, without a change comes over the spirit of those who hold power, where will the conflict for office terminate? It is said that the same class of persons, the same faces that were seen in Washington when the republic was in complete putrefaction, are infesting Richmond.

The agricultural interest is the great conservative interest of the land. Our occupations make us a purer and better people; and as our vocations unfit us for intrigue and political deception, the great agricultural interests should be held sacred and kept free from and independent of all political influences, and would thus stand as the corner stone of the Confederacy, dispensing blessings and security to untold millions. Such a creation is a necessity of the age, and those who do not realize its importance should acquaint themselves with subjects which did not enter into their schooling, or they are totally unfit to take position in the public councils. We have embarked upon the ocean of uncertainty for a perilous voyage, for we are surrounded by adverse elements. If the active, interested, producing element in whom all power resides, stand aloof, lukewarm, and fail to make an effort in keeping with their sacred interests, they will be overwhelmed, and our entire race will either run through the divers places of confusion and wretchedness or leave the land of their fathers. To use a wise saying of the late J. C. Calhoun: "The tax consumers will soon exceed the tax payers, and they will continue to increase in a geometrical ratio until the machine runs down." Our hope is in a corner stone. By which we do not mean a political secretary and a list of inefficient clerks, but an institution which shall find its origin in the constitution, and supported out of the public treasury, which takes charge of all things connected with the interests of agriculture. A university with the most

able corps of scientists that can be secured, competent to their own government and all things connected with those great interests. The institution to be in permanence, and the sciences taught gratis to all who may come, to rich and poor alike. Around them, and under their supervision and direction, practical schools should be established. Botanical and horticultural gardens, to which every useful and ornamental plant shall be brought from every part of the world. Its properties studied and appropriated, so that, in a comparative brief period, every plant would be secured and transferred to its proper position and appropriate usefulness. Such a creation could be made self-supporting, if thought expedient. We should bring to the same end every animal, useful for its flesh, its hide, its hair, its power or other useful qualities. Every bird that would be an acquisition for its feathers, its flesh, its eggs, etc. Every fish that might be considered desirable to introduce into our streams. These objects could be easily attained with a proper administration and at inconsiderable expense. When we reflect that, of animals known to naturalists, out of one hundred and forty thousand but forty-three have been domesticated, and, with but two or three exceptions, all have their origin in the East—the margin for extensive usefulness in that single direction can scarce be exaggerated.

The urus, one of the largest of the ox tribe, has disappeared from the earth. The buffalo is passing away. Many animals not surpassed in qualities by those domesticated might be brought into useful subjection. Under the auspices of other Governments, such institutions are in partial and useful operation. Among accomplishments of recent date, the ostrich may be now claimed as an inhabitant of the poultry yard.

Of this species there are three varieties, two from South America and one from Africa. Independent of the flesh of this bird, which is valuable and excellent food, it might be made subservient for rapid communication. The feathers are much sought after and command a high price; whilst the eggs of one subject will amount to from one hundred and fifty to two hundred pounds per season, of healthful and nutritious food.

Fisheries, once valuable, and which had become valueless, have been resuscitated to great productiveness, and now again remunerate largely the owners of land on the different rivers of Scotland and elsewhere. These results have been acquired to civilization, through science, and fish are now propagated and transported, by means of their eggs, from one part of the world to the other, as easily and regularly as a letter is carried by the post. There is no visible reason why the salmon and other valuable fish should not people the Savannah and other Southern streams, and thus bring to our doors abundant supplies of food, without toil or trouble. But the introduction cannot be made without the aid of those knowing the requirements; and

what individual enterprise would fail to accomplish, such an institution could certainly carry into execution. The ocean is a vast reservoir of life and life food, we may draw upon its resources without stint if we invoke the proper means. The one single species, salmon, would, if introduced into our streams, give an annual augmentation of available food amounting to millions of dollars per annum. These results are already acquired to other nations. The art of artificial propagating fish is become a business, and the stock and price of fishes' eggs are regularly quoted in prices current of Europe. If it be true that the absence of phosphorus is the cause of national decay,* it would appear practicable to make use of denizens of the water as purveyors of that substance from the ocean to our fields. As chimerical as it may appear, it is but a question of time, and will enter into the practice of a day.

We have mentioned the buffalo. We extract from the preliminary remarks of the late superintendent of agricultural affairs of United States for 1860:

"For military purposes the buffalo, if domesticated, would appear to be particularly adapted, perhaps more so than any other animal, not excepting the camel. His great endurance, fleetness and strength would make him efficient as a beast of burden, and for draught, and when no longer needed he could be slaughtered for food. If, by crossing the buffalo on our domestic stock, we could gain the qualities of fleetness, strength of constitution and muscular vigor, with the chances of properties not to be calculated in advance, such results should not be undervalued. Neither should we lose sight of the possibility of the cross proving free from those diseases and epidemics which occasionally make such havoc among our domestic cattle. An indigenous race may be expected to possess, in that respect, special qualities which would render a cross with it highly advantageous."

The domestication of the buffalo has been accomplished to a limited extent in more than one instance; and notwithstanding that the osteology of the buffalo differs very materially from the ox—the former having fifteen ribs, whilst the ox has but thirteen—it crosses with the common or domestic cattle kindly and to all degrees.

In our Confederacy, where we have a system of labor so admirably suited to our purposes, many introductions might be made suited to our wants. We instance animals, the yak, the eland, alpacas, etc. There are varieties of goats, abundant milk-yielding, that might be introduced with great advantage to our negroes. Each family having such an animal, the comfort and advantages to the children might not be over-estimated.

The tea and other plants could be successfully introduced—have been introduced (see Agricultural Report of United States for 1860). The plant thrives well in our climate, and the feasibility of its culture does not admit of a doubt. The collecting

*See Agricultural Report of U. S. for 1859, article Phosphorus.

of leaves might be assigned as a fit duty to those not able for field labor—the too young, the too old, the weakly; and the manufacture of tea limited to domestic wants or, by the adaptation of steam and proper machinery, in quantity for exportation. The uncertain and filthy process practised by the hand in China, could be replaced to any extent by a certain and expeditious process within our reach.

The silk-worm is worthy of attention, for reasons stated above in the culture of the tea plant. Its advantages are fully realized by the nations of Europe. We would invite your attention to new varieties latterly introduced and acclimated in France. These new introductions feed on the leaves of the oak, the ailantus and the palma christi. It is stated, on high authority, that their product can be manufactured at prices so low as to bring the silk cloth into the most common uses, such as making sails for vessels, etc. We have seen these worms at work in the forests, in the environs of Paris, without artificial covering, in the open woods, exposed to all weathers. We have also admired the silk cloth of their produce. We must not forget that, almost within the memory of man, the cotton plant was considered little better than a weed, and it is known to the writer that this continent produces indigenous plants, some of which, if brought into cultivation, might challenge the cotton plant for utility and productiveness, whilst the culture might be less onerous and expensive. The cotton plant vivifies the commerce of the world, and is now the great object of our culture. We make these observations to draw your attention to the importance and necessity of instituting a tribunal of a public character, proper and fit to care for public interests, in a channel not heretofore, and only partially and imperfectly practised. Matters of such paramount importance, originating from and through science, should be entrusted to the keeping of science, which is by no means intuitive, and with which politicians have, and can have nothing to do.

Our country is vast, extending over many degrees of latitude and longitude. Its geology is diversified, which gives rise to soils of a different character, suitable to the cultivation of many varieties of plants. We have, indigenous, those that would be invaluable if subsidized by proper cultivation, and some infinitely better suited to our soil and climate than many exotics which have been introduced and unprofitably cared for. We instance grapes, from which we might anticipate results far surpassing those realized from any cultivated, or those obtained from the continent of Europe. The hybridizing of certain foreign upon indigenous plants might give rise to conquests far exceeding expectations, and through those instrumentalities our gullied and sterile hill-sides would be brought into profitable culture.

Under such an institution a system of exchange could be

organized, thus introducing from all parts of the earth the most useful products of the vegetable and animal creations. Our consular and diplomatic agents could be agreeably subservient to the great end, and thus, without a large expenditure, we might be able to accomplish more than could be calculated in advance.

If the state house, as massive and admirable as it may be, and undoubtedly is, could give place to such an institution, you would have a monument that would stand against the hand of time, more indestructible than granite, and a barrier against the sins of ignorance. When that structure is terminated, it will call for an amount not under three millions, some say three times that amount. The interest of the first-named at seven per cent., would give an annual income of \$210,000, which would secure a permanent blessing, where the entire population could receive an education gratis, of unusual character and of crying necessity. Observatories of all descriptions would be instituted; public gardens established, where the products of different countries would be brought together, their properties studied, and from which plants could be disseminated; important and pointed experiments proceed for adaptation to particular and called-for uses. Collections of objects of natural history, mineralogical and geological collections, libraries and apparatus, for all kinds of practical purposes. Models of the most approved machinery, etc. Such an *ensemble* would present an abiding attraction to persons of all professions and of every age, an interest to the civilized world, a focus of light to untold generations. A corner stone built upon the rock of truth and usefulness. Nor should we undervalue or neglect those refining and elevating influences allied to the arts. The creation of tangible morals, whether from the chisel or the brush, elevate and educate to heroic deeds. Those arts enable the many, born to misfortune, to realize happiness through tranquil paths, to mundane wealth and immortality. Ruben's celebrated picture of the Descent of the Cross, cost for matter and execution about \$300. It has been a model for centuries, an heirloom to his country, of untold value, which no money could purchase. It has proved to be a source of wealth to the State and the City of Antwerp, and a precious source of income to the magnificent cathedral, in whose keeping it is intrusted, besides of inestimable value to the school of art, for which Antwerp is so celebrated.

There are other branches of knowledge connected with agriculture, most of them having a direct influence upon that basis of all prosperity which it is our duty to cherish, and which should be cared for. It would naturally come under and should be placed in some keeping—none more fit than such an institution. We allude to all those things pertaining to the mineral wealth of the nation—subjects of great and primary impor-

tance, but altogether neglected with us, and for which we are now suffering. Other nations consider them of such consequence, that they have particular schools to whose care these subjects are intrusted, and where special instruction is imparted for their preservation, under the immediate jurisdiction of the State; and be it said to their honor and experience, that they are kept religiously distinct and apart from the blighting influence of politics and politicians. In many ways the nation would reap direct benefit from such a connection. Our mineral wealth is great, yet unexplored. If, in a few instances, the contrary has been the case, it has been done regardless of public considerations, for in matter of mines, public and individual interests are in direct contradiction, and those laws which govern property on the surface of the earth cannot be applied to underground values, which have been created once and forever, and given by the Almighty for the use of the nation for all time. It is easily possible to render a mine, of the utmost value, entirely useless, and the ore or combustible inextricable, and of no more value than if it had never been created. This is always, more or less, the consequence of public neglect, and the abandonment of such precarious wealth to the unlimited trust of private cupidity.

The occurrence of mineral wealth is not unfrequently beneath a sterile soil, or in mountainous regions. It certainly will be to this nation, if she advances in prosperity, a consideration that a population other than the agricultural, shall find employment essential to the agricultural wants and the defence of the nation. The extraordinary progress which agriculture has made within the last quarter of a century is due to the science of chemistry, without which, metallurgy and a majority of the useful arts would be unknown. In that and many other ways, the Government would receive direct benefit from the establishment of an efficient chemical laboratory. In fine, such an institution would naturally be charged with the care of all the objects within the scope of the sciences. It would carefully store, in its archives, all the fleeting facts that are discovered, and thus from the known march on making new discoveries and assimilating them to our civilization for ever.

We value our great staple above all the products of the soil; with such an institution in our midst it would not be long before the fibre would be a secondary consideration to the seed; and if we had time to indulge ourselves in that investigation, you would surely never rest until you had laid a corner stone. But few have had time to reflect upon the nature and importance of a nation's mineral wealth, and still fewer have correct views upon chemical geology, mineralogy, the arts of mining, metallurgy, etc.; indeed, it may be safely asserted that our people have scarce any knowledge at all upon those important branches. The absence of that kind of information may be one

of the reasons for our being inflicted with so many pettifoggers and so many licensed murderers; other resources of unlimited usefulness would be created by the corner stone. Most people have vague and confused ideas upon the composition of the earth with which they have so much to do, and of the nature of mineral substances. If they have suffered their minds to dwell upon these subjects at all, they look upon the earth as a heterogeneous mixture of an indefinite number of illy-defined substances, given us to be used for cropping until exhaustion. We wish to be truthful, yet, in making the assertion, we feel shocked that such should be the state of the minds of those engaged in agricultural pursuits. Even among men who pass for educated gentlemen of wealth and position in society, how little they know of these things. If the statement is not exaggerated, and we believe that it is not, it suffices to prove that our structure is without a corner stone.

Without presuming to enter into the details of science, we may be permitted in this connection to remark, that the science and knowledge of the world has proved the material substances composing this earth (air, water, rocks and soil) and all that lives, to be limited in number, not far from sixty; of those simple substances not more than a dozen are immediately connected with that which grows, and out of which all animated nature is formed. These simple substances, limited as they are, do not combine indiscriminately, but quite the contrary, each substance having properties *sui generis*, act and react the one upon the other, according to their respective properties, and are governed by fixed laws, giving rise to the complicated appearances which surround us on all sides, and with which we have to do.

The laws which govern these substances, and their combinations, form the basis of the principal arts upon which our civilization depends. Yet, the majority of those that legislate for us, those who are regarded as the pillars of the State, if not entirely ignorant of these subjects, know little more about them than the popular definition of the term used, which in reality is nothing at all, and so it ever will be without a corner stone.

The extension of the constitution of the United States over California did create the gold that was immediately yielded so abundantly, for it was created in common with the other substances once and for all time; it was the spirit of the instrument which caused it to be brought into circulation. The gold may be removed, it may be divided, and finally lost to our senses; but as nothing is lost in nature, it is only disseminated in inappreciable forms. The gold having been removed from the placers, will never be found there again without it be replaced; it does not grow, nor is it reformed; it were utterly vain to seek for it from whence it may have been removed.

So it is with those elements essential to the production of

those things which have life. It were just as futile to expect a blade of grass to grow without potash, magnesia, lime, phosphorus, etc.; and the essentials necessary to plants are common to all flesh, and in that sense science has taught us the truth of what is written, "all flesh is grass." These essentials to life, to man's existence, individual as well as national, if removed, must be replaced, otherwise there can be neither vegetation or flesh of any kind. It matters not whether those substances be removed in one way or another, whether through grain, grass, milk, or bone and flesh of animals, when gone they are gone for ever, without the sagacity of mind devises agencies for their replacement. These devices may be invoked through science, without which there is no help for us or the nation. It is the corner stone of the structure. It neither disintegrates or decomposes, it is a part of the Almighty. "For without ye shall know that I am the Lord, the cities that are inhabited shall be laid waste, and the land shall be desolate."

If we are so unfortunate as to live to see our children become gamblers, drunkards, demagogues, and squanderers of the fruits of a life of toil—and there are many of this favored land born to fortune and good name, who have followed such routes—it is because there has been no care for the hope of the land, the rising generation, than for the fertility of the soil. You have not offered them proper food for their minds; weeds have sprung up and taken the place of succulent and healthy grass. Depend upon it, the evil will be found in a defective corner stone, or no corner stone at all.

Notwithstanding the special clause in the constitution of the United States for the election of the President, that law became obsolete, and remained a dead letter upon the statutes. It is natural to anticipate that, in the course of time, and that time may not be long postponed, we shall have to contend with factions as sinister in character as those which hastened the pending revolution. Where the appointing power is vested in one man, for it is no more or less than that, the day will surely come when patriotism will yield to political pressure. All positions of honor and emolument will be invaded, and if they lack in number, others will be created to provide for an insatiate demand. Such is history. Look at our country and the struggle in which we are engaged. Human nature is the same here as elsewhere, as it was, is, and will be. The only hope for the country, for the patriotic, those who are rushing to the field of battle for their country, their families and their homes, is to force scientific education upon the whole people; our salvation is with the Lord, and He is in the corner stone.

Varro has said "that without water all agriculture is miserable and without effect." It is an element of fertility largely attainable, and its proper application and use unsurpassed in fruitful results. Artificial irrigation was an agent largely

used by the Mexicans, the Peruvians, the Egyptians, the Romans; now extensively employed by the Chinese, the Germans, the Italians, the French and English. What an immense gain in fertility and actual money would be added to our land if we could avail against the long, parching droughts; if we could divert their agency from evil to be a blessing, as they are in reality. But of the powers and divers means of irrigation, or the economy of water in agriculture, we know nothing practically. The irrigating canals, once so profitably used in Texas, are no longer employed. Nor are we more mindful of the excess of water, often a fruitful source of malarious disease and death. Not less than six hundred thousand acres of Carolina's soil is in this condition, much of it doubtless equal to low grounds of the Nile or Mississippi. Notwithstanding these great natural gifts, your authorities have supinely witnessed, year after year, the exodus of her precious blood by death and by emigration, without making an effort to reclaim these crying evils. How long will you tolerate the absence of a corner stone? Such a department would naturally be charged with the management of like endowments. Proper surveys would be made, estimates and plans for drainage, and final redemption. We might appeal with confidence to such a tribunal for practical plans, without fear of deception, they would enter upon investigations with knowledge acquired by a life spent in special study.

As things are, and have been, the people are slow to give their assent for appropriations, no matter how useful they may be; if economically and efficiently administered, they fear deception and fraud. Offices of high trust, and demanding special knowledge, have been dispensed to political victors, from the legion of vociferous, clamoring stump-orators. Even now, generals are found ready-made and competent to all exigencies. Statesmen are numerous as aspirants. Diplomats were chosen and charged with the interests of millions, who knew nothing of the art, the manners and customs of the people to whom they were sent, and ignorant of the language of the people among whom they were to live and negotiate. Men, no, we will not honor them with the appellation, beasts were the better term, who were in a chronic state of *mania a potu*, were sent as ambassadors to the first courts of the world to represent the United States.* Nor is the example confined to single instances of egregious unfitness or worthlessness. It was well for the honor of the country that the specious apology for departmental secrecy was insisted upon, it was a ready excuse for

*The life of the sovereign, it was thought by the ministers of the Crown, would have been jeopardized, had he been permitted a reception, and that ceremony never transpired in the one instance alluded to. Some years after, the ambassador killed his near relative in a debauch.

covering "something rotten in the State of Denmark." It is to be hoped that the Confederate Government has inaugurated a different history. But there are, of our time, men who should be carefully scrutinized. They may be seen at public gatherings, they drink freely with their fellows, and even pay the liquor. They hold their heads high and talk loud, and are always ready to mount the stump, and talk about patriotism, willingness to self-sacrifice, and to give their last drop of blood and last cent for the people. They talk about God, and about heaven, about the salvation of souls, and become elders of the church. They at times manifest great respect for the moral and civil laws; they are obsequious and fulsome flatterers. Their actions do not accord with their words. Such men are desirous of command, and at all times candidates for position. They are not found standing sentinel; they cannot go into the workshop or the field. If thwarted in their nefarious designs, they break out in all manner of excesses, such as contempt of others, mockery, raillery, hatred, revenge, malicious and deceitful devices, unto death, of their fellow-men. They enter into plots of cunning and deceit, disgraceful to human nature; they would climb to heaven and destroy it, if they could not rule. 'They are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and all uncleanness.'" Beware of such chief-priests, scribes and pharisees—they are self-constituted lords, have no light within them, and should be forever excluded from having to do with the corner stone. "Babylon has fallen, fallen! She became the habitation of devils, never to appear more at all." If you would know the devils, mark the demagogue, and say to him as Nathan said unto David. Thou art the man!

The gratuitous exertions of patriots, through agricultural societies, the agricultural press, and other spasmodic action, is altogether vain. You might as well attack those majestic mountains with a Colt's revolver. The untold wealth that has been squandered and extracted from the soil, that which has been washed into rivers, and thence to the sea, can only be conjectured by undertaking to place each acre in its original fertility. When we reflect calmly on the time and cost dependent upon such an achievement, we are brought to realize the unstable character of a structure without a corner stone. Without the science of navigation to direct the helm, the ship will be stranded; it is but an affair of time. Without efficient incumbents in office we shall be plunged into anarchy, and the fruits of the revolution will be darkness and universal ruin. Events have culminated, the evil is upon us, we have attempted to reconstruct, but the corner stone is wanting.

In bringing these observations to a close, we will assure the toiling thousands, the pure in spirit, the weary and heavy laden, if they would double and quadruple their crops, if they would

have their fields to overflow with milk, with honey and with wine, and the fatted calf always ready, the secret lies in the corner stone. If you cherish the land of your fathers, if you have followed to the grave a fond parent, a devoted sister or brother, or dearly-beloved child, if you wish the land preserved to you, and the privilege of dropping a silent tear upon the drooping violets that mark the spot where they rest, and where you wish to lie, your only hope is in a corner stone. If you would be a shining light for all time, lay the corner stone broad and deep—it is truth—the Lord will be with you, and ye shall abide in the land.

ART. VIII.—THE PIONEERS OF KENTUCKY.

IN WHICH IS CONTAINED SOME ACCOUNTS OF KENTUCKY, SOCIALLY AND OTHERWISE, IN THE YEAR OF GOD, 1817.*

In following the windings of our story, it now becomes necessary to make a transition from Louisiana to Kentucky. At the time of which we write, the State of Kentucky was in that chrysalis, or formative social condition, through which all new settlements must pass, however good or excellent the individual elements composing the aggregate may be.

We are not certain, but we think, it was a remark of M. De Talleyrand, that the traveller who starts on the Atlantic, and goes westward through the American States, till he reaches the tribes of savage aborigines, passes, in the transition, through the same, or very much the same states and phases, social and political, that the philosopher does in a retrospect of the history of Europe from the present time to the Middle Ages—from the period of the brightest development of civilization to the darkest of barbarism—from the perfection of social maturity in full dress, to its infancy in the swaddling clothes of the *cunabula gentium*.

Whatever may have been M. De Talleyrand's opportunities of judging in the premises, or however much of philosophical perspicuity or shrewdness of judgment he may have had, or whether the remark was made by himself, M. De Chateaubriand, or whomsoever else, we deny the truth of the opinion. If it was meant that there was a contrast of extremes between the society of New York or Philadelphia, and the rude barbarism to be found in the wigwam, or around the council-houses of the Western Indians, the remark is too obvious to be discussed; but if it was meant, as probably it was, that the intermediate

* Another chapter, and the last we shall publish, from the manuscript novel referred to and extracted from in our July number, 1861.

population approximated on either hand morally and politically, as the States do geographically, it is not true. We are aware that a *petit-maitre* notion of the same kind prevails among the dilettante *aristocracy* of the Atlantic shore, which, from the emasculating influence of a prevalent effeminacy, can see nothing in the simple, un mutilated majesty of nature, moral or physical, either attractive or inspiring; who pronounce everything to be found in the cities of their abode as *vulgar* and *outré*; and who, like the London cockney in his American travels, cannot admire the Mississippi River, because it does not resemble the *Thames*; nor the broad western forest, because it is not like St. James's Park or Windsor Forest; nor the manly and heroic form of the western pioneer, because it is "too dem huge" to bear any resemblance to the "dwarfing cities' pale abortions." As marvellous as was the birth of Minerva in the chronicles of ancient mythology, a greater marvel, not of myth but of fact, has been witnessed in the birth and growth of the new states or societies of America. The emigrants or pioneers who sold their sterile estates in Virginia, Maryland, and North Carolina, and sought richer lands, or broader possessions for occupation and heritage in the beautiful valleys of the Ohio, the Kentucky, and the Cumberland, were not more barbarians in the countries of their adoption, than they had been in those of their nativity, but were, in all respects, types of the civilization left behind. They carried with them the cultivation, social habits, religious, moral and political principles in which they had been nurtured, and made them the precedents and basis of action, private and public, in the new homes of their choice; and hence was seen a phenomenon more magical, and not less supernatural, or less in accordance with the laws of ordinary expectation, than the growth of the armed men from the dragons teeth sown by Cudmus, of States and communities, with constitutions and forms of government surpassing the ideals of antiquity, if not even the concrete forms of modern States, springing up with the suddenness of a necromantic vision, not upon the ruins of the primitive forest, but side by side with, and under the very shelter of its trees. It is true, these States and communities may have lacked that element of social homogeneousness which only comes by time; they may have been deficient in fine houses and ornamented grounds, and other symbols of advanced civilization; they may have lacked tailors and *modistes*, barbers, *valets de chambre*, and dealers in purples and fine linens, in unguents and spices; they may have had all the faults which spring from isolation of position, from necessary self-reliance, from sparseness of population, from imperfect means of communication, from remoteness from centres of society and commerce; but still their condition was not that of barbarism, nor a state even proximate to it. The Abbé Perigord, to call M. De Talleyrand by his proper, as well as more

suggestive patronymic, being one of those who wore soft clothing and lived in kings' houses, expected probably to see, when he went out into the wilderness, men clothed in soft raiment, like himself; and being disappointed, he pronounced them rugged, but heroic John the Baptists, with their raiment of camel's hair and meat of locusts and wild honey, as men who had at least all the outward type of barbarians.

The English had just the same opinion, and for the very same reason, of these very men at the battle of New Orleans. And yet they gave full evidence of heroism, notwithstanding their caps of undressed skins and unartistic *blouses* or hunting shirts; full evidence of an ability to protect States not less than to make them, though, forsooth, they may not have been perfumed like milliners, or held pouncet-boxes 'twixt finger and thumb, or more exactly suited in appearance to come between the wind and the nobility of the English officers. The first of these tramontane communities admitted to the plenary dignity of a sovereign State, and to honorable and equal alliance with the federal sisterhood of the States of more ancient growth, was Kentucky.

Notwithstanding the minute and seemingly accurate researches of Monsieur Rafinesque, "A. M., Ph. D., Professor in Transylvania University, Member of the Kentucky Institute, and *fifteen* other scientific and literary societies in the United States and in Europe," into the history of Kentucky, researches extending back to a period not only anterior to the discovery of America by those modern navigators, Columbus, Vespuccius, and Cabot, but even anterior to the birth of Christ and the creation of the world, according to the new-fangled chronology of Ushed, we apprehend little was known definitely of Kentucky prior to the advent of John Finley in the year of Christ, 1767, from the British province of North Carolina. At the date of the earliest explorations, and probably for many years before, it had not been occupied as a local habitation or permanent residence by any particular tribe of Indians. From its abounding in verdure of the richest luxuriance, as well as in salt *licks* and springs innumerable, it seems to have been reserved by agreement, tacit or otherwise, as a pasture for the flocks and herds of buffalo, elk and deer of the wild children of the woods, whose permanent places of abode lay to the north and south of it. In a council of Shawnees, assembled at Chillicothe, in 1775, to meet Captain Thomas Bullett, who was sent out to Kentucky as a surveyor by William and Mary college, the chief remarked, in answer to a *talk* of Bullett: "You mention to us your intention of settling the country on the other side of the Ohio with your people. And we are particularly pleased that they are not to disturb us in our hunting. For we must hunt to kill meat for our women and children."

Its name, belonging to some one of the aboriginal dialects, it

is said, means the "dark and bloody ground," which, with its numerous mounds and places of sepulture, is the melancholy memento of the fierce struggles of the different tribes for its permanent possession, or the casual but bloody collisions of the chase. When the first chance pioneers returned to the white settlements, their stories of the goodly land, seen in their wanderings, wrought upon the fancies of the people, like the cluster of grapes borne between Caleb and Joshua when they returned from reconnoitring the promised land; and when, like those ancient scouts, they intimated the presence in the land of those fierce sons of Anak, the people, unlike the children of Israel, were far from imagining themselves grasshoppers in their sight, or other than men of full stature, ready and willing to meet them upon terms of equal combat. Never did a finer set of men than Boone, and Harrod, and Logan, and Kenton, and Shelby, and Harden, and Whitty, and Clarke, and their companions, go forth to conquer a country and subdue an enemy; and never was a country defended with a fierceness more savage, or a struggle more protracted.

For twenty years or more, every log cabin was a small citadel, occupied by an armed garrison of men, women and children; for twenty years the inhabitants went armed to their fields by day, and slept upon their arms at night. The baptism of blood seemed the initiatory or preliminary rite of her civilization—of her admission to the political fold—or of expiation for the dark and bloody deeds whose souvenirs survived in her territorial name and history. The struggles through which she passed, while they developed among her people a heroism of individual character, a fearlessness, energy and self-reliance, in combination with warmth of feeling and uncalculating generosity and hospitality, developed also a restlessness of disposition which was always craving excitement—an intensity of feeling which constantly begat disputes and discussions, and frequently feuds and quarrels, and a morbid desire for change, which distinguished itself in the love of perilous adventure, in impatience under legal, political and social restraint, and in a disregard of authority. Territorially a part of Virginia, and deriving her population chiefly from that source, her normal characteristics were those of Virginia, as those of Virginia were those of the Cavaliers of England, and she fully vindicated the legitimacy of her descent in connection, perhaps, with some slight tendency of exaggeration. Mr. Washington Irving, in his experiences of Ralph Ringwood, the *nom de plume* of the late Governor Du —, of Florida, a Virginian by birth, but a Kentuckian by early adoption and long residence, speaking of a Judge — (to be introduced hereafter in these memoirs), of Kentucky, also a Virginian by birth, says: "He was of the Sir Charles Grandison school of gentlemen. *Sir Charles Grandison Kentuckyized*," which means, we suppose,

that he was a Virginian, *only more so*. And what this may mean, may be explained; perhaps, by a story which is related of the late Abbé ———:

Being some years ago on a visit to America, he sojourned briefly at Lexington, Kentucky, then the seat and centre of Western civilization. Stopping at Posthwait's hotel, the then chief if not only caravansera of the city, he lost his patience—the Gallic measure of which grace is known not to be inordinate in quantity—under the thrice daily infliction of loud talking and swaggering manners of the then Young America, who promenaded the public rooms of the hotel with their long segars, broad shirt frills, high-heeled boots and bell-crowned hats. Rising from his seat one day, he walked the floor in the *midst* of them with impatient strides for a brief interval, and then stopping before a map of the United States he singled out the State of Kentucky and the City (?) of Lexington with his finger, and exclaimed in a voice sufficiently audible to be heard: "Be gar, zis is ze Gascogné of America." We think the Abbé did more than justice to Lexington and Kentucky in making them the sole subjects of a compliment which should have been bestowed upon every other town and State of the Union, for we think all have an equal claim to that peculiarity of which the province of Gascony seems to have had eminently the undisputed monopoly.

Let it be attributed to whatever cause it may—to the difficulties of a first settlement, to the heterogeneousness of population, the isolation of geographical or rather political position, with difficulty of access to the inhabited portions of Virginia, and a closed port to her trade by reason of a foreign occupation of the Balize, or mouth of the Mississippi—there existed among the people of Kentucky, a morbid, if not preternatural susceptibility to excitement. It exhibited itself in her threats to form an independent Government; in her intrigues with Spain in reference to a separate commercial treaty, and with republican France, when the latter was trying to reduce the United States into an *entangling* alliance with her; and in her bitter opposition to the *alien* and *sedition* laws; her disposition to sympathize with Aaron Burr; her active sympathy in the prosecution of the war of 1812; and her continued political agitation upon topics of local and federal interest down to the present time. At the date of our narrative her political organization was complete. From being first a county of Virginia, and then a district, she had become a State, with a constitution equal to any. Her bar, her judiciary, her legislature, her State councils, were all occupied by men of unusual energy and talent. In the federal congress and cabinet and judiciary, and in the foreign diplomacy of the Government, her sons had taken position as peers with the greatest of the sons of the older States. The political exigencies of the past, whether external or inter-

nal, had been met and outlived. Population was pouring in from all quarters, and covering the broad and unoccupied valleys of the western and southern portions of the State. The country which lay to the south of Green river, originally made the subject of military reservation by the State, was being settled up by an active and enterprising people. Nothing seemed to be lacking but a spirit of quiet content and peaceful industry to develop a social organization, both healthy and vigorous; nothing seemed to be required but that the spirit of restless and reckless excitement should be exorcised, to give her stable prosperity.

But this was not to be, the Highlander was not yet ready to give up the heath and the *raid*; the Bedouin was not yet ready to exchange the horse and the desert for the conventional restraints of the walled town. The element of excitement existed, and needed but a subject for its exercise, and as in every other case, it is in society, the excitement being normal, will soon furnish a method of exercise to itself. During the war with England, the stagnation in business, and consequent financial depression had operated with special if not peculiar force upon the interests and industry of Kentucky. Upon the conclusion of peace, the reaction in every department of business, and the appreciation of every species of property will be remembered everywhere as extraordinary. Excited cupidity, and sanguine hope could or would set no limits to the future prosperity of the country. Everyone looked upon himself as a prospective millionaire, and anticipated his privileges as such.

In Kentucky, there was conceived to be but one obstacle between the people and the goal of untold wealth, and that was the scarcity of the precious metals. Those old-fashioned representatives of the value of property were looked upon, at best, as "slow coaches;" as sluggish in the extreme, and not at all calculated to keep pace with the business demands of a country so growing. It was not conceived that the earth contained in its bowels gold and silver enough for the people of Kentucky, much less for those who lived outside. Everything was on a scale of dimensions so Brobdignagian, that there was not conceived to exist financial ability enough among men to solve the rising problems of trade and currency. Every man was an Adam Smith, a Say, a Rothschild, save with improved ideas—and ideas improved by living in Kentucky. After much resort to logarithms, or some system of speculation out of sight of the common, it was decided, among the people, that forty banks would be, perhaps, able to obviate the difficulty implied in the scarcity of gold and silver; and the legislature very amiably gratified them—which was one in proportion of every thousand square miles of territory, and ten thousand of population. The long-coveted El Dorado of the Spaniard had been discovered. The long-sought eureka of the alchemist had been

found. A succedaneum for gold and silver had been invented. Oh, Joseph Balsamo, or Cagliostro, where wert thou? Oblong pieces of tissue paper, with engraved promises and symbolical vignettes, signed and countersigned with ink, and mysteriously lettered and numbered, were abundant as leaves on the trees. Murray, Draper, Fairman & Company had become the benefactors of the race. Every species of property, real and personal, quintupled in *price*, if not in value. The artisan deserted his shop, and the farmer his plough, to sit at the baize-covered table of the directory of a bank. The technical phraseology of finance had become the common-place language of men, who, hitherto, had not pretended to "wisdom nor understanding," and whose "proper talk" previously had only "been of bullocks." The pious thought that it was the period of the millenium; the preachers that it was the solution of some mystic or unexplained prophecy; the philanthropist, that it was the *summum bonum* of civilization; the politician, that it was the actual reproduction of the phantasies of More or the visions of Fenelon; the old men and matrons saw visions of fine houses, fine furniture and fine equipages; the young men and maidens dreamed dreams of fine horses, fine clothing, and fine balls and parties. Such was Kentucky in 1817-'18, and such were Kentuckians.

ART. IX.—THE EXISTING CRISIS.

"THE PROVIDENTIAL ASPECT AND SALUTARY TENDENCY OF THE EXISTING CRISIS."

A pamphlet, marked with some power of thought and abounding with highly important facts, has recently appeared at New Orleans under the above caption.

Although not free from objections of asperities in language, and not well sifted of extraneous matter, nor free from errors, to be noticed presently, nevertheless, so admirably has the author succeeded in accomplishing the main design set forth in the title page, that the extensive circulation of so valuable a document cannot fail to be highly useful to the Confederate cause at the present time.

Unfortunately, the people of those States are not sufficiently supplied with book agencies and other facilities for the extensive distribution and diffusion among themselves of the works of their own writers. Owing to this cause, some of the most valuable contributions to Southern literature have fallen still-born from the press. They would have lived and thrived if the South had been provided with the requisite agencies for infusing vitality into them and nursing them into growth. Printers

must be paid; and it is expecting too much of the press to look to it to do the work the public ought to do through the agency of organized societies. Without such societies to herald the advent of printed matter of a valuable kind, as the pamphlet under review, and to assist in its circulation, not much good can be expected from it, or even from that most valuable of Southern works, DeBow's Review, because the number that ever see or read it, or even hear of its existence, must necessarily be very limited in so extensive a region as that occupied by the people of the Confederate States. Notwithstanding the objections above mentioned, the extensive circulation of the monograph on "*the existing crisis*" abroad, could not fail to be highly useful to the Confederate cause beyond the Atlantic. One of the errors of the publication, an error into which the Samson of Southern literature, George Fitzhugh, has also fallen, is the overlooking of the fact, that the policy of the Governments of Europe is so bitterly hostile to everything that bears the name of *slavery*, and the minds of their people so inflexibly turned against it, that it would be folly to expect that fact and argument, in favor of *slavery*, can possibly meet with the slightest attention or encouragement in any kingdom of Europe. But one of the most happy results of the present war will be the proofs afforded by it, that *neither slavery nor slaves, in the European sense of those terms, have any existence at all in the Confederate States of America*. Heretofore, the knowledge of the existence of two very different and distinct conditions, which created beings are subjected to, both bearing the name of slavery, has almost been entirely confined to that learned few known as naturalists. In one of these conditions called slavery, the slaves are slaves made by nature, in the other the slaves are made by artificial means. The slaves that God made are not to be found in Europe, except in the beehive and ant-hill. There, the natural historians have demonstrated their existence in overwhelming numbers, and, from the thrift and happiness of those slaves of nature, have justified the wisdom and benevolence of the all-wise Creator. From the facts contained in the pamphlet, entitled "*Existing Crisis*," the important knowledge can be obtained that a similar kind of happy, contented and joyous slaves of nature's making, as those found in the beehives and ant-hills of England and France, are found in the cane, cotton, rice and tobacco fields of the Confederate States. It gives the facts, proving that by whatever name they may be called, that there are no laborers the world over better supplied with the comforts of life or half as contented, cheerful and happy.

After having promulgated the great truth of the existence of two very different kinds of slavery—the one *natural* and the other *artificial*, and of two kinds of *slaves*, those made by nature and those made slaves by artificial devices, the author of the

pamphlet under review fell into the grave error of not strictly adhering to the line separating those two very different conditions, but confounds them together by using the old terms *slavery* and *slaves*, as applicable to both. Strictly speaking, there is not a slave in the Confederate States, as the term slave is understood in Europe and in the North. The term slave conveys the idea to Europeans of a man deprived of some of his most essential natural rights and privileges. The negro has a natural right to the protection and guardian care of the white man, and nowhere else is he put so fully in possession of his natural rights as in the Confederate States. Almost everywhere else he is thrown out of his normal condition, that of dependence on the white man, into the abnormal one of dependence on himself. When forced to depend upon himself, he is like a bee excluded from the hive, and is most wretched, unhappy and unthrifty. Abundant facts in proof are given in the pamphlet.

The author of the "Existing Crisis" does not give sufficient credit to the leading minds of Europe for sagacity, when he attributes their neglect to recognize the Confederate States, as an independent power, to a want of knowledge of their dependence upon us. It is a knowledge of that dependence which has delayed the recognition, with the hope that the high price of cotton, caused by the blockade, might stimulate its production in other countries, and in their own tropical possessions; and thereby relieve them of the painful feeling of dependence on what they are pleased to call, *slave-labor* cotton. The manufacturers of cotton have, for many years, been ransacking the world to find other fields for the production of the great staple to feed their looms, and have been our most implacable enemies; but if they would examine well the facts contained in the pamphlet, they would not only find a balm to soothe their consciences and dissipate their fears, that the supply from this country was in any danger of failing than from the overthrow of slavery—a balm extracted from the great eternal truth, that slavery, in their understanding of the term, or in any other sense than the slavery the Creator established in the beehive and ant-hill, has no existence in the Confederate States of America. The author of the pamphlet has fallen into an error, which many others besides himself have fallen into, when he supposes that the most potent government in Europe would necessarily be subverted if the supply of cotton should be cut off. The government that existed a thousand years before they had cotton mills, would not necessarily fall to pieces on closing the mills. Labor would be diverted into other channels.

The grand experiment the manufacturers are now trying in opposition to us, is the experiment of seeing whether cotton in sufficient quantity, and of the requisite quality, cannot be pro-

duced by what they call *free laborers* in other parts of the world. The withholding our cotton from market, or lessening its production, is essential to the success of the experiment. With the blockade removed, the experiment would fail. It will probably fail at any rate, from a law of nature that the manufacturers are not apprised of. The cotton plant grows over half the earth, inhabited by half the so-called free laborers on the surface of the globe. Flowers gem the whole earth, and many kinds of bees and other insects extract honey from them; but by a law of nature, the honey thus extracted by the humble bee and other *free laborers*, is not available; the only honey worth bringing to market is that which is the product of the industry of the *slave-laboring bees*. Nature has also provided a similar kind of happy *slave laborers*, rejoicing in their work of supplying the world with cotton, with the beneficent design of giving the people of all nations a cheap clothing, and of putting in action more spindles, looms and needles than ten times their own number of free, white laborers, with their busy fingers, can set into profitable motion for themselves and starving families. If the two hundred millions of the so-called *free laborers*, spread over the cotton lands in the possession of England in India, Australia and Africa were to average four pounds of cotton each, the sum total would be two millions of bales. They have never made the fourth of that quantity. Whereas, the four millions of those *natural slaves*, called negroes, although not half of them are engaged in cultivating cotton, have averaged more than four hundred pounds each. Indeed, the work of supplying the markets of the world with cotton would seem to be consigned to those *natural slaves*, the barbarians of Africa, to bring them into the light of civilization, and for other wise purposes, set forth in the pamphlet, as the work of producing honey has been assigned to those *natural slaves* found in the domestic hive, known as nature. Though differing in their appearance and organization from the other members of the hive, an *amor inginitus*, or natural affection, binds the entire community, as a similar innate principle binds together the black and white races of the Confederate States, making them all alike the bitter foes of the meddlesome and intrusive red republican wasps. Under the mistaken idea that the South was burdened with four millions of *artificially created slaves*, the abolition North made war upon it, expecting to crush it in a short time with but little trouble or expense, by metamorphosing the supposed slaves into so many black avengers. The red republican wasps have themselves already been severely stung in meddling with those Southern hives, the Confederate States. Already have they lost their own liberty in the vain attempt to destroy slavery—a thing which never had any existence in the South, as they understand the term. Even Mr. Everett, with all his learning, let his gross ignorance of the institutions of the

South leak out in a Fourth of July speech, in which he declared that "the attempt to hold fifteen States in the Union by force, would be accompanied by a servile insurrection." This, instead of restraining the fanatics of the North, hurried them headlong upon the fields of Manassas. A servile insurrection necessarily implies the existence of slaves in the full sense of that term as understood by Mr. Everett and the abolitionists. A vast deal of blood and treasure will, no doubt, yet be wasted, before Mr. Everett and the Northern people learn the simple truth that neither *slaves* nor *slavery*, as they understand those terms, have any existence in the Confederate States, or ever had. The pamphlet under review would cut short the present war, if they would read it and believe in the homely truths contained in it, although its style would not exactly suit the fastidious taste of such scholars as Mr. Everett.

ART. X.—CONFEDERATED REPUBLICANISM OR MONARCHY.

These two great opposing principles, which are like the centripetal and centrifugal forces in the solar system, were subjects of profound study, and sometimes of fierce discussion, among our ancestors.

On the one hand, the colonies, just become independent States, after each had adopted a separate constitution, and been separately recognized in the treaty of peace, were unwilling to surrender their sovereignty, then a fact clear as the noonday sun, although a certain Solomon of the present day ascribes their very existence to the federal constitution. In the second article of Confederation, it is distinctly stated, that "each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence." (Mr. Lincoln can, perhaps, explain how a State can retain what it never had.) Although this declaration is not repeated in the constitution, soon after adopted, yet the 9th and 10th articles of amendment to it declare, that "the enumeration in the constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people;" and that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." It is hard to conceive how these reserved rights could ever have been defended, if it had been necessary to wait until a dominant and oppressive majority acknowledged its usurpations, before the States dared to resist them. Our forefathers might just as well have been asked to wait for a confession of error by the British parliament, before taking up arms.

Before the revolution, each colony had governed itself with-

out the interference of the others, and without any other control than that of the Crown; and now, having become a State, was loath to substitute any other supremacy for that whose abuse had driven it to resistance. On the other hand, the exigencies of the terrible war from which the colonies had just emerged, made them keenly sensible of needing some central power to unite their scattered energies for common defence.

The States, acting separately, seemed ill-qualified to adopt a financial system for paying the war debt. Taxation, without the intervention of the State Governments, seemed expedient for that purpose.

The bands of society had been loosened by the demoralizing effects of all war, and all felt the necessity of, in some way, tightening those bands. Commerce, too, so indispensable to the financial prosperity of the country, was languishing for want of some uniform system of regulation.

These considerations led many of our wisest men to advocate what have been called the national features of our federal Government, whose very name shows it to have been, in the belief of those who use that name, a *treaty* between independent States. But there were not wanting those, who, jealous of centralized power, regarded the articles of confederation as an ample provision for all exigencies.

The struggle between these parties was severe, and, in several States, doubtful. It is said that, had all the members of the Virginia convention obeyed instructions, the constitution would not have been adopted by that State. North Carolina and Rhode Island stood aloof for sometime, the latter nearly two years, after the requisite number of States had adopted the constitution and were organizing the Government. With these facts staring them in the face, some men of high intelligence have yet inferred from the ambiguous phrase, "We, the people of the United States," that it was adopted by the population of the country, acting as one nation, and not thirteen distinct nations. States could never have been *united* without pre-existence, and it is a certain historical fact that each of them acted separately and independently. They had determined "to form a more perfect union," not in duration, for the articles of confederation declared it "perpetual," although under them it lasted only a year, but in its character. George Mason, Patrick Henry and others, feared and predicted that this "more perfect union" would end in consolidation. Their prophetic vision is shown by the present condition and sentiments of the United States, far more even than by any actual usurpations of its Government before the separation of the Confederate States.

Unrestrained by fear of Southern statesmen, consolidation stalks forth *monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum*. It is to be hoped that the New York Ulysses, who

put out the eye of the Cyclops, will not escape his range. But to return, the Cassandras were disregarded, and the features of the constitution which they feared were adopted. It became, then, a question of the last importance, how it should be construed, and who should construe it in the last resort. One extreme advocated a strict, literal construction of its language, the other a broad, latitudinous one, while the golden mean was, perhaps, to be found in a fair interpretation. The strongest federalists claimed no powers for the Government, except those expressly granted, or such as were "necessary and proper for carrying into execution those powers." Yet, agreeing thus far, as they were obliged to do, the parties differed very widely as to what was the meaning of "necessary and proper." A strictly literal construction of "necessary" would have stopped the machine of Government, and would have rendered the addition of "proper" superfluous, if not absurd. It was plain, therefore, that *some* latitude and discretion were indispensable in understanding the former word; but while the party, jealous of the Government, was for restricting the phrase within narrow limits, their opponents were for giving it greater extension.

The former of these parties triumphed at the commencement of the century, under Mr. Jefferson, as its leader; and during the sixty years since, all administrations, save one, have professed to be governed by its principles. But they have differed as widely in the interpretation of the famous "Virginia Resolutions and Report," of 1798 and 1799, as the parties had done in construing the constitution. These documents had been called forth by "The Alien and Sedition Laws" of the elder Adams. The admission of Louisiana, and the embargo of Mr. Jefferson, and Mr. Madison's War of 1812, made New England talk of secession and practice nullification. Then came the protective tariff and the nullification of South Carolina, whose remedy for the admitted grievance was generally disapproved by the States which occupied the same position.

In these and other cases, the jealousy of the States-right politicians may have exaggerated, or sometimes even have imagined the usurpation. Yet the constant tendency of things was to accumulate money, patronage, and power in the hands of the general Government.

There was one subject, always a cause of anxiety and alarm to our wise statesmen, which was approached, forty years ago, in a manner that startled Jefferson in his retirement, and, despite all efforts made then and since to heal it, left behind an immedicable vulnus. Those whose tender consciences led them to trench on ground utterly unknown to the constitution, forgot an injunction of Scripture, which should be earnestly commended to the attention of all meddling philanthropists. "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a *busybody* in other men's matters." From

which it seems, that the apostle Peter classed *busybodies* with murderers and thieves.

The free States acted on a very different principle when they objected to the admission of Missouri, simply because its constitution permitted slavery, as the constitutions of twelve out of the original thirteen States did, when the federal Government was organized. They knew perfectly well that no such Government could ever have been established had it been expected to do this, or to exclude slavery from one foot of land belonging to the public. Virginia's voluntary action in regard to the Northwest territory is entirely different, and the invasion of her soil by the occupants of that rich gift by no means recommends the example.

It is vain to say, that many of the wisest statesmen in Virginia and other Southern States considered slavery an evil, to be gotten rid of at the first opportunity. It was their own matter, with which "a stranger" should have "intermeddled not," and in regard to which their opinions might change, as they have changed.

George Mason, grandfather of our commissioner to England, thought slavery an evil; but, in his earnest opposition to the federal constitution, expressed a fear that it did not sufficiently protect property in slaves.

In looking back to 1820, we must lament now that the South did not plant itself immovably on the position that the pretension of the North to interfere must be surrendered, or a division at once take place. It would certainly have been better for both parties, although the writer, in common with far wiser men, once thought otherwise. The South would, doubtless, have taken that stand, had it not been for a very prevalent conviction among her own statesmen, that slavery ought to be defended, where it existed, without any effort to extend it into the territories. This sentiment, combined with the natural love of peace, and of the Union established by our fathers, made our representatives assent to the compromise. This seemed to work well for some years, although disregarded, the very year after its adoption, by the North; but, when California was acquired, those who were horror-stricken afterward by its repeal, refused to extend its principle to the Pacific, alleging that they were bound by the letter of the bond only. In short, a free-soil party arose, whose avowed object was to exclude from every foot of public territory an institution existing in twelve out of the old thirteen States. This was a combination of usurpation and insult, which was submitted to far too long.

To make it appear no usurpation, they gave the most latitudinous construction to the constitution, and pretended to hold property in slaves, which had existed from the earliest records of history, a mere creature of municipal law, and only coextensive with that law. The Northern mind was excited to

abate the nuisance by denunciation of slavery and slaveholders in books, pamphlets, orations, poems and hand-bills. Fletcher, of Saltoun, thought a nation's songs more important than its laws. In this case, not only the songs, but the whole literature of one region was employed to dictate the laws of another, and *quoad hoc* independent region. Had the people of the free States admitted our theory, that the general Government was a derivative, limited Government, which could not touch any local institution, abolition literature, while embittering our intercourse, could never have affected our legislation. But, thinking that the nation had a right to remove the supposed stigma from its escutcheon, they brought into power a party, whose avowed ultimate object was the extinction of slavery.

Secession and war resulted, not because, as has been sometimes said, the Union was a rope of sand, but because the dominant party desired to make it a chain of iron, crushing forever all State rights. It was a fatal mistake to suppose that union, like an arch, was to be strengthened by pressure.

With this experience before them, it is "passing strange" that some in the Confederate States, not so many, indeed, as Mr. Russell pretends to have found in South Carolina, are calling for a stronger Government, and even for a monarchy. It is a folly, like that of the Israelites in asking for a king, because "the sons of Samuel perverted judgment." The "perversion of judgment" by Abraham, or rather by the party which has made him its tool, is surely no reason for giving up in despair the experiment of our ancestors, which has never been fairly tried.

Let us rather amend, where experience has proved amendments necessary; abstain from offending local prejudices or interfering with local interests, and administer the Government with simplicity and fairness, so as not to accumulate large funds and large patronage in its hands. We may mortify our pride and sacrifice convenience in so doing; but we shall consult our true safety and guard our liberty by avoiding great and splendid schemes.

It has been the fashion to deride republics, and especially confederacies, as wanting in dignity, concentrated vigor and permanence. But the sneerers ought to recollect that republics have been very few in comparison with other Governments, and those few confined to Europe and America. Perhaps the only experiment of a republic, "one and indivisible," is that of France in her reign of terror. While we properly shrink from imitating such an example, we must admit that it was an astonishing outburst of national power and energy. Yet, like consolidation in the United States, it was a horrible despotism. Lincoln's question, "In what does a county differ from a State?" would have been exceedingly pertinent to a country

whose provincial boundaries were completely obliterated, and all whose laws were reduced to a dead level of uniformity.

If we look back to confederacies, we shall find something to deplore, but far more to admire. In them, local emulation, sometimes a source of weakness and division, usually intensified activity and development.

No country has attained greater or more deserved celebrity than Greece. Its Government was never, while it remained independent, centralized, but was, on the contrary, as intensely local as its spirit. Although variously modified, and bearing different names, it was, almost everywhere, a popular Government. Whatever was done in combination, was done by confederations, which were constantly changing, and sometimes difficult to form, even in the face of dangers so imminent as the Persian invasion. Yet, despite of jealousy and dissension, its two most distinguished tribes, the Athenians and Spartans, repelled the most numerous army yet seen upon the globe, and shed a halo of glory around Marathon, Plataea and Salamis, whose brightness no length of time, no familiarity can obscure. In the fifteenth century, all Greece, under a far more vigorous Government, and invigorated by a mixture of Norman chivalry, fell an easy prey to a far less numerous army of Turks from the same Asia.

The noble spirit and intellectual activity, nursed by the emulation of its independent tribes, made Greece the mistress of the world in literature, science and the fine arts. The republic of Athens, so often quoted for fickleness, ingratitude and want of permanence, yet lasted, with some interruptions and modifications, two hundred years, a longer period than the justly-praised Government of England has had its present muniments of freedom. She lost her naval power and wealth by trying to centralize, in herself, the whole power of a confederation, of which she was the acknowledged head; while the sun of her literary renown left behind it a twilight which has not yet faded away. It is worthy of notice, that all this was done by a very small, and, by no means, fertile region, always weighed down by the *incubus* of slavery. We can scarce conceive what it might have done, with some Sumner, or Wendell Phillips, or Lincoln, to remove that *fatal* pressure.

Rome was, at first, one of many confederated cities or States, and, in her best days, was united by federal ties of different degrees of closeness with most of the States of Italy, which had been conquered by her arms. Had all these States been united in one fair, equal league of representative Government, she might have avoided a social war, costing three hundred thousand lives, and forced on her allies by her consolidating tyranny. That war depopulated Italy, led the way to other civil wars, and ultimately to that centralization, which exhib-

ited great power and outward splendor, but corrupted the very heart of Roman civilization.

Let us not forget that here, too, a *miserable slaveholding* people displayed a practical genius for war, legislation, and great works of taste and solid utility, which no other nation ever surpassed.

Coming down to modern times, we may observe little Switzerland, whose career of five hundred years has tested the value of a confederacy. Her victories over the Austrian chivalry at Morgarten, Laufen and Lunpach, and over the powerful Duke of Burgundy at Granson and Morat, prove the land of Tell equal in military prowess to that of Leonidas. Her progress in literature, the arts, and in civilization, is as great as could possibly have been expected in so rugged a country. Yet her confederation is an incongruous mixture of Catholics and Protestants, of aristocrats and democrats.

Look now at the Dutch republic, the rise of which has been immortalized by the pen of Motley, whose defence of Northern tyranny cannot make us forget his eloquent vindication of oppressed and struggling Holland. That industrious people won their domain, first from the ocean, and then from the hands of the most powerful and remorseless monarch of his time. The Dutch rivalled the exploits of Grecian valor and patriotism, established their colonies and trade in every sea, and came near wresting the trident from the British Neptune. We are yet to learn, that the "one and indivisible republic," on the French model, or the monarchy which succeeded it, has advanced or even restored the prosperity of Holland.

The land of Grotius attained the height of its glory under a confederation so loose, that the consent of each of its seven provinces, and of each city in every province, was required for the adoption of every measure. This led to some occasional inconvenience, and the dictatorship of a stadtholder, yet the country pressed onward in its career of wealth and renown for two centuries.

This retrospect is certainly not calculated to discourage us from persevering in our experiment of Confederate Government. Its inconveniences are like the delays that are said to be the price of liberty. Let us throw every State, as much as possible, on its own resources and energies, and deny to the general Government great power and patronage, except in an emergency like the present war. Let no protective tariff, no partial legislation, no interference with local property or prejudices provoke dissension. Kind feeling, and a sense of common interest, and not force, must be the cement which binds together the Southern Confederacy.

ART. XI.—COMMERCIAL IMPORTANCE AND FUTURE OF THE SOUTH.*

The report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of March 26, 1860, gives a statement of the condition of the banks of the United States, from which I have prepared the following tables, showing their capital, loans and discounts, specie, circulation and deposits. That we may the better realize their relative strength, I have given the population of each State, and have separated the slaveholding from the nonslaveholding States.

Slaveholding States.	No. Banks & Branches.	Capital.	Loans and Discounts.	Specie.	Circulation.	Deposits.	Population.
Alabama	8	\$4,901,000	\$13,570,027	\$2,747,174	\$7,477,976	\$4,851,153	995,917
Delaware	12	1,640,775	3,150,215	208,024	1,135,772	976,226	112,352
Florida	2	300,000	464,630	32,876	183,640	124,518	145,694
Georgia	29	16,689,560	16,776,282	3,211,974	8,798,100	4,738,289	1,082,797
Kentucky	45	12,835,670	25,284,869	4,502,250	13,520,207	5,662,892	1,159,609
Louisiana	13	24,496,866	35,401,600	12,115,431	11,579,313	19,777,812	666,431
Maryland	31	12,568,962	20,898,762	2,779,418	4,106,869	8,874,180	806,796
Missouri	38	9,082,951	15,461,192	4,160,912	7,884,885	3,357,176	1,201,209
North Carolina ..	30	6,626,478	12,213,272	1,617,687	5,594,047	1,487,273	1,008,342
South Carolina ..	20	14,962,062	27,801,912	2,324,121	11,475,634	4,166,615	715,371
Tennessee	34	8,967,037	11,751,019	2,267,710	5,538,378	4,324,799	1,146,640
Virginia	65	16,205,156	24,975,792	2,943,652	9,812,197	7,720,662	1,593,199
Texas	660,955
Arkansas	440,775
Mississippi	887,158
New Mexico and Indian Territory	120,000
Total	327	\$128,176,517	\$207,749,681	\$38,912,129	\$87,107,018	\$66,074,585	12,683,246

Nonslaveholding States.	No. Banks & Branches.	Capital.	Loans and Discounts.	Specie.	Circulation.	Deposits.	Population.
Connecticut	74	\$21,502,176	\$27,856,785	\$989,920	\$7,561,519	\$5,574,900	460,670
Illinois	74	5,251,225	387,220	223,812	8,981,723	697,037	1,687,404
Indiana	37	4,343,210	7,676,861	1,583,140	5,390,246	1,700,479	1,370,802
Iowa	12	460,450	724,228	255,545	563,806	527,378	682,002
Kansas	1	52,000	48,256	8,268	8,395	2,695	143,642
Maine	68	7,506,890	12,654,794	670,979	4,149,718	2,411,022	619,958
Massachusetts	174	64,519,200	107,417,323	7,532,647	22,087,920	27,804,699	1,231,494
Michigan	4	755,465	892,949	24,175	222,197	375,397	754,291
N. Hampshire	52	5,016,000	8,591,638	255,278	3,271,183	1,187,991	325,072
New Jersey	49	7,884,412	14,909,174	940,700	4,811,832	5,741,465	676,684
New York	303	111,441,320	200,351,332	20,921,545	29,959,506	104,070,273	3,851,563
Ohio	52	6,890,838	11,100,462	1,828,640	7,982,889	4,039,614	2,377,917
Pennsylvania	90	25,565,582	50,327,157	8,378,474	13,152,892	26,167,843	2,924,501
Rhode Island	91	20,865,569	26,719,877	450,920	3,558,295	3,553,104	174,621
Vermont	46	4,029,210	6,946,523	198,409	3,882,983	778,834	315,827
Wisconsin	108	7,620,000	7,592,361	419,947	4,429,855	3,085,813	768,485
California	384,770
Minnesota	172,793
Oregon	52,566
Utah Territory	50,000
Washington do.	11,624
Nebraska do.	28,893
Nonslaveholding ..	1224	\$293,713,547	\$484,195,949	\$44,662,408	\$119,997,469	\$187,715,544	19,033,113
Slaveholding	327	128,176,517	207,749,681	38,912,129	87,107,018	66,074,585	12,683,246

* Views submitted by General Duff Green to the Macon Convention, 1861.

I find in a newspaper an article, credited to the N. Y. News, so appropriate, that I quote it at large :

There is so much misapprehension in relation to our foreign trade, and it is so important at the present juncture to have a correct understanding upon the subject, that, at the risk of repetition, we shall recur to it again. For this purpose we shall take from the official returns of 1861 the amount of exports, distinguishing the exclusively Northern from the exclusively Southern origin of the articles :

UNITED STATES EXPORTS.			
NORTHERN ORIGIN.		SOUTHERN ORIGIN.	
Products of the sea.....	\$4,156,180	Forest	\$6,085,931
Forest.....	9,368,917	Breadstuffs	9,567,397
Provisions	20,215,226	Cotton.....	191,806,555
Breadstuffs	19,022,901	Tobacco	19,278,621
Manufactures	25,599,547	Hemp, etc.....	746,370
		Manufactures	10,934,795
Total Northern origin...	\$77,363,070	Total Southern origin.	\$238,419,680

Total exports.....\$335,782,740

Imports consumed.....336,380,172

These are the figures of the treasury table, and their careful consideration may dispel some strange illusions that possess the public mind. Among the items, it will be observed, under the head of products of the forest, Georgia pine and lumber, naval stores, etc., bear a high figure. All those who have been patiently awaiting the South to be "starved out," will observe, with some surprise that it supplies one-third of all the breadstuffs exported from the Union. Hence, if they cannot "eat cotton," they will not starve. The manufactures which originate in the South form also a small sum total for which many are not prepared.

The result is, that the North furnishes one-fourth of the merchandize exported and the South three-fourths. It will now be understood that three-fourths of the national exports are embargoed by blockade. It is very important thoroughly to understand that fact, because on it hangs all the *finance of the war*. Breadstuffs and provisions, it will be observed, form one-half of the Northern exports, and the harvest in England being good, those articles, if sold at all, must be sold very low.

If we turn to the importations into the country we find the following results :

IMPORTS.			
	Specie.	Goods.	Total.
North	\$4,780,598	\$316,842,381	\$321,592,970
South	3,770,546	36,802,738	40,573,284
Total.....	\$8,551,135	\$353,645,119	\$362,166,254

The specie imports at the South are mostly silver from Mexico, and of the merchandize, coffee counts \$9,731,617; sugar for \$3,500,000; for Western account, iron, queens-ware, etc., for the balance. Now, if we bring the aggregates together, they will show as follows :

	Total Im.	Total Ex.	Excess Im.	Excess Ex.
North.....	\$316,812,381	\$77,367,070	\$239,449,311
South	36,802,738	238,419,670	\$201,616,932

We have here the conclusive fact that the three-fourths of the whole foreign trade of the country is Southern. The exports are produced there,

and the goods they get payment for come to them through New York, to the great profit of its merchants. The South also sent North, for Northern consumption, last year, as follows :

Cotton, 1,000,000 bales.....	\$55,000,000
Tobacco	10,000,000
Sugar	18,000,000
Rice.....	1,000,000
Wheat and corn	5,000,000
Naval stores	1,000,000

Total	\$90,000,000
-------------	--------------

For this and more, domestic manufactures and Western produce, mingled with imported goods, went South in payment. The whole of this is blockaded. The Morrill tariff was intended to increase the proportion of domestic manufacture and diminish the proportion of imported goods sent South in payment.

It will now be remembered what we recently stated, that even if the North can sell as much breadstuffs this year as in the year of short harvests, she has in round numbers but \$80,000,000 with which to pay for the tea, coffee, sugar and all those articles that made up this aggregate of \$336,280,172 of goods imported, besides \$22,000,000 of interest money to be paid abroad. To import the same amount will involve the payment of \$256,000,000 of specie in a single year, or every dollar in the country, North and South. If one-third only of the usual imports were made, the pressure for specie will be such as to make loans impossible and taxes unavailable. An importation of \$125,000,000 only, would give hardly more revenue, even under the Morrill tariff, than would pay the interest on the public debt, while it would convulse the country by draining it of specie.

The fact must continually be borne in mind that the Middle and New England States can, of themselves, have little or no trade with England and Western Europe, because they are producers of the same articles. New England competes with Old England in the purchase of raw materials and food, and the sales of manufactured articles. There are no trading interests between them. They both want Western food, and both want Southern materials. Of the importations that are brought into New York, a large portion goes to the South, which raised the produce with which they were purchased through New York commercial houses.

In this connection, we call attention to the following, from the London Economist, in relation to the British trade for the first three months of this year :

“ Our commerce with the South and with the North is now for the first time divided in the official tables. It appears that all our direct exports are to the North. The figures are :

Exports to Northern States.....	£3,922,133
Exports to Southern States.....	174,563

Showing a startling contrast in the amount we actually sell to the two bel-ligerents. The contrast is nearly as remarkable in what we buy, only it is reversed !

Imports into Great Britain from Northern ports.....	£4,697,868
Imports into Great Britain from Southern ports.....	6,136,186

“ We see in these simple figures the record of the causes of much that has occurred in Lombard street.

“ It is, therefore, difficult to say with which of the combatants in this miserable struggle we are the most connected. One party supplies us with the

materials of our industry, the other party purchases the fruits of that industry from us."

This is a very singular error for so high a commercial authority as the London Economist to fall into. What England receives is Southern produce, direct from the South; but what she sends to the North, that is to say, New York, is on its way to the South. If the separation was unfortunately to take place, England would not continue to sell largely to the North, but the goods would go direct to the ports from whence the raw material is derived. In such an unfortunate state of affairs, the West would be bound over hand and foot to the Eastern States. She would have to buy their manufactures dear and sell them food cheap. The interests of the South and the West are identical, both being agricultural, and both of them sources of supply for Europe in opposition to the Eastern States. The great Western valley of the Mississippi, with its undeveloped natural manufacturing advantages, has the vast Southern market open to its future enterprise, when capital shall have accumulated from agricultural industry and fertile land. This war is retarding her progress fifty years at least, and perhaps ruining it forever.

If we analyze the condition of the Banks, we find that they had—

Loans and discounts	\$691,945,580
Circulation	207,102,477
Deposits	257,802,127

Making a mass of credits of	\$1,156,850,184
Whilst the specie in all the Banks was only	83,594,537

It will be seen that, with a population of 3,851,563, New York had—

Capital	\$111,441,320
Deposits	104,070,273
Loans and discounts	200,351,332
Specie	20,921,545
Circulation	29,959,506

The slaveholding States, with a population of 12,683,246, had—

Capital	\$128,176,517
Deposits	66,074,585
Loans and discounts	207,749,681
Specie	38,912,129
Circulation	87,107,108

Why is this? We have seen that the South furnish \$238,419,680 of the exports, whilst the entire North furnish but \$77,368,070; and as these exports are the basis of our foreign trade, their must be some efficient cause which has produced such a striking difference between the financial organization of the North and of the South. What is that cause? Is it not that the South is agricultural and the North is commercial and manufacturing? Is it not because the financial system of the United States was organized in reference to the business of the North, and that the organization is not suited to the business of the South? The dealings of the merchant and manufacturer are from day to day. The dealings of the planter are from year

to year. The banking system of the United States was organized in reference to the business of Northern men, and is therefore adapted to the business of merchants and manufacturers, whose daily receipts enable them to make frequent payments; but it is not adapted to the business of planters, whose receipts being from year to year, require an entirely different financial arrangement. Is the condition of the financial world such that we can organize a financial system suited to the industry and wants of the South, which will enable the planters of the South to make a safe and profitable use of credit? I believe it is, and propose to create, as the basis of such a system, an agency, to consist of an incorporated company with sufficient capital, to be invested in good public and private securities, with branches and agencies in the several Confederate States and in Europe.

Have we the means of creating such an agency? The cotton crop may be estimated at \$200,000,000 per annum. Part of the proceeds invested in the Treasury notes or bonds of the Confederate States, and paid in as the capital of the "agency," would create at once a basis of credit which would enable the agency to borrow money in Europe on their hypothecation, at a low rate of interest, for a term of twenty or thirty years, and to advance funds to railroad companies, and to planters and others, upon such terms as may be suited to their means of payment.

But though such an agency would, in this way, do much toward the financial independence of the South, it would do much more by furnishing ample means for a direct trade to Europe and elsewhere. Our merchants have heretofore dealt chiefly in New York and New England, and it will be difficult for them to obtain credit in Europe, because they are not personally known there. Such an agency as I propose could, through its branches and agencies in the Confederate States, ascertain the character and standing of merchants wishing to purchase goods in Europe, and, by letters to their branches in London, Paris and elsewhere on the continent, enable any merchant in the Confederate States to purchase goods upon as favorable terms as any merchant of New York could do under any system of credit whatever.

Can such an agency be organized? I believe it can, and rely upon an appropriation of part of the proceeds of the cotton crop and of such part of the funds invested in our railroads as will give the strength and resources requisite to the end proposed. Such an agency should be so organized as to realize the strongest possible credit, and this can be done if we can sufficiently unite the planting and railroad interest of the Confederate States. Union and concert of action between them would be for their mutual advantage, and would command the co-operation of a large mass of capital already invested in railway shares and bonds now held in Europe, and bring to our aid a body of so much wealth, intelligence and influence as to se-

cure certain and permanent success. But as the proposition embraces the railroad as well as the planting interest, I have prepared the following tables from data given in the Railroad Journal and the published returns of the late census, showing the miles of railroad in operation in each State and their cost with equipments, the area of territory and the population of each State—separating the slaveholding from the nonslaveholding States:

SLAVEHOLDING STATES.	Miles of Railroad in operation.	Cost, with equipment.	Area in sq. miles.	Population.
Alabama.....	798.6	\$20,975,339	50,772	995,977
Arkansas.....	38.5	1,130,110	52,198	440,775
Delaware.....	47.9	2,345,825	2,120	112,353
Florida.....	289.8	6,368,699	59,268	145,694
Georgia.....	1,241.7	25,687,220	58,000	1,082,797
Kentucky.....	458.5	13,852,062	37,680	1,159,609
Louisiana.....	419.0	16,073,270	41,346	666,431
Maryland and District of Columbia..	833.3	41,526,424	11,070	806,796
Mississippi.....	365.4	9,024,444	47,151	887,158
Missouri.....	723.2	31,771,116	65,037	1,201,209
North Carolina.....	770.2	13,698,469	45,500	1,008,342
South Carolina.....	807.3	19,083,343	34,000	715,371
Tennessee.....	1,062.3	27,348,141	44,000	1,146,640
Texas.....	284.5	7,578,943	274,356	600,955
Virginia.....	1,525.7	43,060,360	61,352	1,593,199
New Mexico and Indian Territory....	400,000	120,000
Totals.....	9,665.0	\$279,533,065	1,283,850	12,683,246

NONSLAVEHOLDING STATES.	Miles of Railroad in operation.	Cost, with equipment.	Area, in sq. miles.	Population.
California.....	22.5	\$2,477,110	160,000	384,770
Connecticut.....	665.6	25,198,199	4,750	460,070
Illinois.....	2,757.7	107,720,937	55,409	1,687,404
Indiana.....	1,327.9	31,656,371	33,809	1,370,802
Iowa.....	395.3	13,317,475	50,914	682,002
Maine.....	544.6	20,431,701	35,000	619,958
Massachusetts.....	1,428.3	65,319,921	7,800	1,231,494
Michigan.....	1,132.8	44,072,226	56,243	754,291
Minnesota.....	1,000,000	81,259	172,793
New Hampshire.....	565.2	17,785,111	9,280	326,072
New Jersey.....	556.4	26,463,455	6,851	676,084
New York.....	2,756.4	137,077,621	46,000	3,851,563
Ohio.....	3,008.2	127,949,123	39,964	2,377,917
Oregon.....	185,030	52,566
Pennsylvania.....	3,081.1	149,509,261	47,000	2,924,501
Rhode Island.....	63.6	2,747,568	1,200	174,621
Vermont.....	537.9	21,785,752	8,000	315,827
Wisconsin.....	826.0	44,576,044	53,924	768,485
Utah Territory.....	187,923	50,000
Vashington Territory.....	123,022	11,624
ansas Territory.....	114,798	143,642
braska Territory.....	335,866	28,893
Totals.....	19,834.5	\$842,118,135	1,644,044	19,033,113

There are some striking and instructive facts exhibited in these tables—the first of which is, the large sums invested in railroads, and the character of the investments. Much of the sum so invested in the Confederate States is advanced by planters, more on the account of the reduction of the cost of transportation of their cotton, than of the dividends on the shares. With them, it is a means of placing their crops in market, rather than an investment of capital. The appropriation of the sums so invested, as part of the capital of an “agency,” to be substituted for the Northern and foreign agents, whose credit has been heretofore so important a part of the machinery, by which Southern produce was placed in the foreign market, would seem to be natural and easy; and especially when we take into account the fact that the railroads now in use are but the commencement of a system requiring an expenditure many times greater than has been made, and that the proposed agency would enable Southern railroad companies to obtain funds for the further extension of the system, upon terms much more favorable than could otherwise be done.

It is now well understood and admitted that money, properly and economically expended on well-located railroads, adds from five to ten times the sum so expended to the value of the property connected with such improvements; and that much of the boasted wealth of the North was derived from the use of their credit, and in the expenditure of the large sums invested in their railroads. The sums thus expended in the North were chiefly borrowed, and the credit which enabled them to borrow was created, chiefly, by the exports which were derived, as we have seen, from the South. But there is another striking feature of the past, which is, that the credit of the Northern railroad companies was worth more, and funds could be obtained by them in Europe on better terms than they could be obtained by the railroad companies of the South. The Northern roads cost an average of \$42,364 per mile, while the cost of the Southern roads was but \$28,929. The value of the exports of the South was more than three times that of the North, and being chiefly in cotton, rice, tobacco, lumber and naval stores, all bulky and heavy articles and comparatively cheap commodities, furnishing nearly, if not quite, eight times the transportation, gave greater and more certain employment to the Southern roads, and consequently a surer and better basis of credit. Why, then, was the credit of the Northern railroad companies better than the credit of the Southern? Why could Massachusetts borrow money in Europe at less than five per cent., when some of our best Southern railroad companies could not get it at ten per cent.? Is not the answer to be found in the fact that the North has been the financial agent of the South? That, whilst the excess of Southern products exported was \$201,616,932, the excess of Northern imports was \$239,449,311.

Does not this solve the problem? Does it not explain why Northern credit has been worth more than Southern credit?

Have we no remedy? How did the North obtain the control of so large a part of our exports? Was it not by their association of capital that they were enabled to control the machinery of commerce? The credit of an association of fifty persons, each worth ten thousand dollars, is much stronger than the credit of either or all of them separately. It is in the association of capital, and concert of action, that the financial power of the North consists. If we would relieve ourselves from the tax, which they have levied on the profits of our labor, we, too, must have associations of capital and concert of financial action; and our association and our action should be adapted to the nature and wants of our industry. The products of Northern labor are made available, as I have said, from day to day, at short periods; therefore the bank discounts at sixty or ninety days supply their wants and maintain their system of credits. The products of Southern industry are made available from year to year, and therefore the planters require a different financial system to enable them to make a profitable use of credit. Hence, the Northern banks, in concert with the European consumers, have organized a system of credits for the movement of the cotton crop, which assumes to be a prompt payment to the planter, but which in truth, gives to the purchaser a credit of nearly twelve months; taxing the planter with several commissions and sundry charges, which he is required to pay as an indispensable part of the machinery, by which more than \$200,000,000 are paid for Northern imports out of the proceeds of the sales of Southern products, to be charged with a large additional commercial profit by the Northern merchant, before the Southern planter is permitted to use the merchandize imported and paid for with the products of his industry.

I am aware that the planter should not be a merchant, and that merchants, ships and banks are indispensable parts of the machinery of foreign commerce. I do not propose to make the planter a merchant, or to dispense with a single Southern bank or a single Southern merchant. What I propose is, to substitute an association of persons interested in the production and transportation of Southern staples in lieu of the Northern and foreign agents, who, by the use of the credit predicated on their control of Southern labor, have levied many millions of dollars in the shape of commissions and commercial profits, upon the sale of the products of Southern industry. The process heretofore has been that the merchants, factors and banks of the South delivered the products of Southern labor to Northern or European agents, in exchange for their credit in the shape of bills, which were paid out of the proceeds of sales made in the North and in Europe. I propose to

substitute a Southern agency, composed chiefly of Southern planters, who, by depositing with the agency in payment for shares, Confederate bonds and notes, or other good securities, will create a *bona fide* capital, which would have here, and in Europe, greater resources and a better credit than the Northern or European agents to be superseded by them, and who being directly interested in protecting the value of their own labor, will use their credit and capital thus created to prevent its depreciation in the foreign markets. It will require no less Southern banks and no less Southern merchants to carry on the trade of the South than heretofore. So far from reducing the number or the profits of the Southern banks or Southern merchants, it is apparent that if, as I believe, the agency will aid in giving a direct trade with Europe, and by dispensing with Northern agents and Northern merchants, increase the value of Southern exports, it will increase in like proportion the amount of Southern imports, increasing in that proportion the consumption of foreign goods, which being free from the Northern taxes heretofore levied in the shape of custom duties and commercial profits, will not only increase the number, but will proportionally increase the profits of Southern merchants. The banks are the appropriate agents of the merchants, and a system which increases the number and profits of the merchants will benefit the banks.

But I return to the objection that the planter should be a planter. He now employs a factor, through whom he transfers his crop to the Northern or European agent, by whom it is sold in the North or in Europe. What I propose is, that the planters shall, by association, create an agency to supersede the Northern or foreign agents. I admit that the value and efficiency of that agency will depend upon the persons chosen to manage it, and that these persons will be chosen by the planters. But if the planter is competent to select factors qualified to select the Northern and foreign agents, heretofore part of the machinery of Southern trade, surely they will be competent to select proper persons for the management of the agency to be organized by them as a substitute for the Northern and foreign agents heretofore selected by their factors. The question then is reduced to this: Are the planters of the South competent to select proper persons to manage such an agency, and can such persons be selected in the South? That the planters can afford to pay salaries sufficient to command the best talents, of tried and unimpeached integrity, cannot be questioned; and that such persons can be had for sufficient compensation, is apparent in the skill and enterprise which characterize the people of the South, whether tested by the management of our banks, our railways, our literary institutions, or in the cabinet, the forum, the plantation or the field of battle. That we have among us persons competent to execute the trust, and that the

association will be fully competent to select them, we require no further proof than a comparison of the management of our banks and our railroads with the management of the banks and railroads in the North. What Northern railroad can compare favorably with the railroads of Georgia, or what president or superintendent of a Northern railroad can compare favorably with the presidents and superintendents of our railroad companies?

But these considerations address themselves to the pecuniary interests of the South. I would present higher and stronger motives for the proposed association, which belong to the political relations of the Confederate States with the other people of the earth.

The entire population of the world is estimated as follows:

Africa (an estimate) from 60,000,000 to.....	200,000,000
America	67,896,041
Asia, including islands	775,000,000
Australia, and islands.....	1,445,000
Europe	275,806,741
Polynesia (an estimate).....	1,500,000

Making estimated population to be.....1,321,647,782

As the population of Asia is so much greater than that of Europe, and the trade of India has, in the progress of European civilization, been more or less a monopoly, it has, in turn, enriched the nations by whom it was enjoyed, from the days of Solomon until now. A close monopoly of this trade was held by the British East India company for more than two hundred years. They levied a tribute so great and imposed burdens so onerous, that, having exhausted the accumulated wealth of the former Governments of India, they were compelled to rely, for payment of their demands, chiefly upon the cheap manufactures of India. But the invention of the cotton-gin, the power-loom and the spinning-jenny, had reduced the cost of textile fabrics in England so much below the cost of production in India that the East India company could no longer make a profit on such goods imported from India. It was also found that the other European nations, profiting by the example of England, had established for themselves a system of manufactures, and instead of being, as they had been, consumers of British goods, had become competitors in the markets of the world. These European nations had few or no tropical colonies, and it was seen that, exercising a control over the trade with India, England, by exchanging her manufactures for the tropical products of India, suited to the wants and consumption of her European competitors, could still levy a tribute, in the shape of commercial profits, on the tropical products of India, which she might receive in exchange for her manufactures, and sell for consumption to the other nations of

Europe. But it was foreseen by Warren Hastings, the conqueror of India, and he wrote a pamphlet to prove that African labor in America could produce at less cost than the labor of India could produce in India, and that therefore the abrogation of the African slave-trade was indispensable to a profitable trade with India. It was seen that the abrogation of the African slave-trade necessarily involved the abrogation of the monopoly of the East India company and the repeal of the discriminating duties favoring the West India planters; and the merchants of Liverpool interested in the slave-trade, the owners of West India estates and the East India company united their influence and prevented the contemplated measures, until 1833, when the British Parliament emancipated the slaves in the West Indies, repealed the discriminating duties favoring West India produce, abrogated the East India monopoly and opened the trade of India to British enterprise. The late wars with Russia, India and China, were but parts of the same system of measures for the maintenance and promotion of British commerce, and illustrate the extent and the manner in which the power and resources of England will be exerted for that object. Let us pause and examine the bearing of these facts upon the future of the Confederate States, and especially upon their relation to the interests and prosperity of the planters of these States.

The productive industry of a people is the true source of their wealth. England and Wales, with a population of less than 20,000,000, are estimated to have, in their machinery, a creative power equal to the labor of 600,000,000 of men. It is the profits derived from this employment of her capital that enables her to pay \$411,000,000 of taxes, the sum required to pay the interest on her national debt and the current expenses of her Government. With her, then, the maintenance and continuance of her system of industry and commerce is an indispensable necessity. She has 5,000,000 of people employed, and more than \$500,000,000 of capital invested in the purchase and manufacture of cotton, and is dependent upon the Confederate States for three-fourths of the supply of the raw material. The question which most interests the more civilized and wealthy nations of the earth, who use machinery, is, how they can most advantageously dispose of the products of their industry to the less civilized, who do not use machinery; and hence, France and England, burying the traditional hatred of ages, united in opposing the progress of Russia and in the war with China, and made it a condition of the peace with China that they should be permitted to introduce their manufactures into China, and to take Chinese coolies, as laborers, to Australia and Algeria—the purpose being to use them as *slaves*, in the culture of cotton. I refer to these facts to show the relation which the growth and manufacture of cotton have to the pro-

gress and civilization of the age in which we live, and to enforce the necessity and propriety of an association of those interested in its production, for the maintenance and advancement of their common interests. We have a climate, soil and labor which enables us to defy all competition; and we may assume that the progress of events and of public opinion will vindicate the character of our industry, and place the Confederate States among the first and greatest of civilized nations; and yet there are several features in the crisis in which we are now placed which deserve to be considered.

The population of the United States in 1790 was 3,929,872, of whom 697,897 were slaves. In 1860 it was 31,676,217, of whom more than 12,000,000 were in the slaveholding States and more than 4,000,000 were slaves. The same relative increase would, in the next seventy years, give within the limits of the late United States a population of 255,000,000, and to the slaveholding States, including New Mexico and the Indian territory west of Arkansas, nearly 100,000,000, of whom 24,000,000 will be slaves, enabling the South to furnish more than 24,000,000 bales of cotton.

Europe, excluding Russia and Turkey, has a population of 195,434,660, on a territory of 1,455,205 square miles, divided into fifty separate Governments, as follows:

<i>States of Europe.</i>	<i>Sq. miles.</i>	<i>Popult'n.</i>	<i>States of Europe.</i>	<i>Sq. miles.</i>	<i>Popult'n.</i>
Andorra (Pyrenees).....	190	7,000	Mecklenburg-Schwe-		
Anhalt-Bernburg....	339	56,031	rin.....	4,701	541,395
Anhalt-Dessau -Cot-			Monaco.....	12	7,627
ten.....	678	119,515	Nassau.....	1,736	443,648
Austria.....	248,551	35,040,810	Oldenburg.....	2,470	294,359
Baden.....	5,712	1,335,952	Portugal.....	34,500	3,568,895
Bavaria.....	28,435	4,615,748	Prussia.....	107,300	17,739,913
Belgium.....	11,313	4,671,183	Reuss, Principalities		
Bremen.....	112	88,856	of.....	588	121,203
Brunswick.....	1,525	274,069	San Marino.....	21	8,000
Church tates of the	12,082	2,110,086	Sardinia.....	34,026	11,029,219
Denm.....	21,856	2,468,713	Saxony.....	5,705	2,122,148
France.....	212,341	36,746,432	Saxe-Altenburg....	491	135,574
Frankfort.....	39	79,278	Saxe-Coburg-Gotha.	790	153,879
Great Britain.....	110,846	28,888,597	Saxe-Mein-Hilburgh	968	168,816
Greece.....	18,244	1,067,216	Saxe-Weim-Eis'n'ch	1,403	267,112
Hamburg.....	135	222,379	Schwartzburg - Rud-		
Hanover.....	14,600	1,843,976	olstadt.....	405	70,030
Hesse-Cassel.....	4,430	726,686	Schwartzburg-Sond-		
Hesse-Darmstadt....	3,761	845,571	ershausen.....	358	62,974
Hesse-Hombourg....	106	25,746	Sicilies, the two....	41,521	8,703,130
Holland, with Lux-			Spain.....	176,480	15,454,514
embourg.....	13,890	3,494,161	Sweden }.....	170,715	3,639,332
Ionian Islands.....	1,006	246,483	Norway }.....	121,725	1,490,047
Lichtenstein.....	61	7,150	Switzerland.....	15,261	2,391,478
Lippe.....	445	106,086	Waldeck.....	455	57,550
Lippe Schaumburg.	170	30,144	Wirttemberg.....	7,568	1,690,898
Lucac.....	142	55,423			
Mecklenburg-Strelitz	997	99,628	Totals.....	1,455,205	195,434,660

Now, when we take into consideration the fact that England waged a war of more than twenty years against France to pre-

vent the conquest of any of these Governments, for the avowed purpose of maintaining the balance of power as it existed in Europe, and that she has since united with France to arrest the progress of Russia and to compel China to purchase her manufactures and furnish coolies as slaves, it is not to be presumed that she will permit the United States to annex her American colonies, or that she will unite in the subjugation of the South. For, as if the Union had been preserved and the same ratio of increase were maintained, it would give to the United States at the end of the next seventy years more than 255,000,000 of people, it surely requires no argument to satisfy intelligent minds that England will greatly prefer to foster and strengthen the Confederate States, not only because she prefers the creation of an independent Government as a check upon the otherwise preponderating power of the United States, but because the failure of all their efforts to obtain a supply of cotton elsewhere must convince the manufacturers of England that our soil, climate and labor are best suited to its production, and if they do not purchase the raw material from us, we will become their most successful competitors in its manufacture. For the slaveholding States, including those to be formed west of Arkansas, will have a territory of more than one million two hundred thousand square miles, capable of sustaining a population greater than all the population of Europe; and as England and the other manufacturing States of Europe will be dependent on us for the supply of the raw material, so essential to their industry, it is to be hoped that the late success of our arms will induce the leading powers of Europe to unite in urging the acknowledgment of our independence, and that their interference will give us peace. If the war and the blockade continue then, if the Confederate Government purchases the cotton crop and pays for it in treasury notes without interest, that purchase and the expenditures of the war will give us an abundant and cheap currency to be employed in building up manufactures; and availing ourselves of improved machinery, we can convert our cotton into yarns and cloths; and should the war continue for three years, we can then supply the increasing demand in Africa, India and China with greater profit than it can be supplied by Great Britain herself.

The estimate is that she has invested—

In spinning and weaving.....	\$326,250,000
In dyeing and bleaching.....	150,000,000
In transportation and purchase of cotton.....	47,500,000

Making the entire sum which she has invested in the manufacture but.....\$523,750,000

The war of 1812 caused large sums to be invested in manufactures in the Northern States; and if the war continues and we are prevented from exchanging our cotton for British manufac-

tures, it will divert large sums into manufactures in the South. We will in that case be enabled to produce cheaper and undersell all competitors. We can raise our own food, and thus we will have cheap bread. We can raise our own cotton, and thus save the cost of transportation. We will be more than half way on the route from Europe to China, which is to become the chief market; and if England and France do not unite with us in coercing a peace, the shipping interest of the East and the manufacturing and agricultural interests of the northwest will soon unite and give us a peace. If they do this, and the northwest be wise and become a separate Government, as is more than probable, then if that section establishes proper commercial relations with us, it will become the seat of the richest manufacturing industry in the world; and receiving their supplies of the raw material and tropical products from the South, these two people will be bound together by interests stronger even than the late constitutional Union. In either case we should have our "agency" to foster, promote and sustain our financial independence.

Do you not see in the manifestation of God's providence, in the progress of the slaveholding States, that He has committed to them, as a chosen people, an important and peculiar trust, connected with the spread of His gospel? Did He not send the Huguenots to South Carolina, the chivalry to Virginia and North Carolina, the Puritans to New England, the Quakers and Scotch-Irish to Pennsylvania, and the Catholics to Maryland, under circumstances which necessarily gave birth to the revolution which created the United States? Did He not by the slave-trade bring into the United States some four hundred thousand African slaves, who, by their natural increase, now number more than four million? Has He not permitted a false philanthropy and a false religion to bring the descendants of these Africans within the Southern States, where the climate, soil and productions give the best reward for their industry? Has He not fostered and developed the resources of these States, so increased their numbers and so trained and educated our people that they have the strength, the will, the resources and the knowledge, aided, as they manifestly are, by His superintending providence, to assert and maintain their independence as a nation? Do you not see that the tendency, if not the inevitable consequence of the pending war will be to give a unity of interest and of opinion, and a consequent permanence to the Government of the Confederate States, which, as their territory is sufficient to sustain a population of more than two hundred million, must in a few years give them a numerical strength greater than any other of the civilized nations of the earth? For it is obvious that, instead of having such a bond of union as our institution of African slavery gives to us, the rivalries and conflict of interests between the Eastern and West-

ern States of the federal Union will cause them to divide, like the Governments of Europe, into many nationalities. Do you not see that the active and angry discussions of the questions of slavery and the tariff, which have so much absorbed the public mind for the last thirty years, were providentially interposed to unite us and prepare us as a people for becoming a separate and independent nation? Have you not seen that our President and congress acknowledge that the strong hand of the Almighty has upheld our armies and given them the victories won on the field of battle? Do you not realize that the great heart of our people, of men, women and children, unite in one common sentiment of faith, gratitude and praise to God for these manifestations of His preference and protection?

Why is it that we, as a people, are thus made the special objects of God's providence? What is the trust committed to us, and what its purpose? What is our peculiar characteristic as a nation? Is it not that we are the owners of African slaves, and produce by their labor the greater part of the cotton which forms the basis of that commerce which is so efficient an agency for the spread of the gospel? If I am correct in these views (and who can doubt it?) then the Confederate States are to be the first and greatest of civilized nations; a people chosen in the providence of God, to whom He has committed, in an especial manner, an important part of that commerce which is, as it were, the wings upon which He sends His gospel to heathen nations? If this be so, and credit be, as we have seen, so important and indispensable for the development of our industry and the extension of commerce, then such an organization and consolidation of capital as the proposed agency will create, is not only a financial necessity but an indispensable Christian duty. For, if the war continues, it will give a safe and profitable investment of the notes and bonds of the Confederate States; and if we have peace, it will aid the direct trade to Europe, and so far as it may prevent an undue export of specie, will sustain the credit of our banks and give stability to our currency, which will promote the employment and greater distribution of labor, which will secure our permanent prosperity.

ART. XII.—SOCIETY, LABOR, CAPITAL, ETC.

The socialists, who have subjected society to a more searching analysis than the political economists, and who are far more profound philosophers than they, have detected the principle and practice of exploitation universally pervading society, and complain that, according to all modern systems of ethics and all popular estimation, the scale of human merit is exactly

graduated according to the amount of injustice or exploitation that each man perpetrates on his fellow-beings. The capitalist who, by the scheming and cunning and profits of trade, transfers ten millions of the results of other people's hard labor to his own pockets; who never did a day's hard, productive work in his life; who has grown rich by the war of the wits, out of other people's labors, not because he was more sensible, but because he was more selfish and cunning than they; who now enjoys an income of five hundred thousand, and, therefore, commands (taking men in families) the labor of ten thousand (so-called) free laborers (for a half million dollars is fully as much as ten thousand of the common laboring class will earn, after allowing a meagre support to their families); this man, who, by most equivocal arts and practices, has become the owner of ten thousand free laborers (we will not degrade the term by saying master), this man has mounted the topmost round of the scale merit, and stands at the head of society simply because he is the greatest of exploitators. He has combined the exploitation of skill and of capital. Skill in trade earned his capital. And, now, capital *commands* from labor his income. He takes no care of his slaves as the masters of negroes do. Indeed; does not know who they are, and could not care for them if he would. This he should know, however, that other people's labor creates his income, and that he pays them nothing in return, for he preserves his capital intact, and has nothing else wherewith to pay.

The lawyer in successful practice stands at the head of those who exploitate by means of skill. He works for thirty dollars a day, and commands thirty days work of common male laborers for one of his, or sixty days work of female laborers, supposing they work for fifty cents a day. Now, the lawyer's work is not half so meritorious or productive as that of the needle-woman or the ploughman, for he as often advocates the wrong side as the right one; yet, though less useful and meritorious, it is a hundred times as reputable and respectable. He stands next to the millionaire in the world's esteem, because he is a great exploitor; whilst the poor ploughman and needle-woman are little more thought of than the positively wicked and criminal, because they exploit nobody, and are exploited by everybody. They belong to the common laboring class, who in truth support everybody; for skill and capital always contrive to throw the whole burden of society on this human substratum. They are the slaves of all above them, and are allowed by skill and capital to retain less of their own earnings than negro slaves; wherefore the Yankoes justly boast that "free? labor is cheaper than slave labor."

All this the infidel socialists (for they are all infidels or sceptics) have discovered, and depict a world in which iniquity seems to lord it over justice, virtue and morality. But only

seems! Profounder philosophers than the political economists, the socialists, are but philosophers. They have not probed into all the secrets of society, do not comprehend the infinite complexity of the moral world, nor understand the wisdom of God that is ever educing good from what appears to us evil.

How eloquently and mournfully does Campbell describe these sceptics and infidels:

"Are these the pompous tidings ye proclaim,
 Lights of the world, and demigods of fame?
 Is this your triumph—this your proud applause,
 Children of truth—and champions of her cause?
 For this has science searched on weary wing,
 By shore and sea, each mute and living thing!
 Launched, with Iberia's pilot from the steep,
 To worlds unknown, and isles beyond the deep?
 Or round the cope her living chariot driven,
 And wheeled in triumph through the signs of heaven?
 Oh! star-eyed science hast thou wandered there,
 To waft us home the message of despair?
 Then bind the palm, thy sages brow to suit,
 Of blasted leaf, and death-distilling fruit!"

Campbell's Pleasures of Hope, Part II.

What the socialists have not discovered is, that exploitation is the price which man pays for civilization. And he does not pay dearly for it. The worst-conditioned peasant in Europe, in a moderate lifetime, enjoys ten times as much of the luxuries and comforts and necessities of life as the roaming savage. Exploitation and slavery begin so soon as the lands are appropriated by the few. Those few permit the many to live and subsist on them on condition that they (the many) will supply the artificial wants of the land-owners, and fabricate comforts and luxuries for them. Thus is civilization initiated, and in no other way can it be brought about or sustained. No man would build for himself a fine house, or fabricate fine furniture, or fine clothes for himself. If all lands were in common, and consequently, all men free, all would dress in skins, and live in caves, or hollow trees, or in some equally simple way; men fabricate luxuries for others, to procure necessities for themselves. The most luxurious man going to a new country, where he has to cook his own dinner, cooks it as simply as the savage or the negro. Set men free, and they at once become savages. They are not free until they are equal participants in the soil, either by direct ownership, or by means of other capital which will command the products of the soil. Yet, compelled to work by capital owned by others, and exploited of a large portion of the products of their labor, they are infinitely better off than they would be in a country where lands were in common, and of consequence, all men improvident savages. The ancient Britons numbered a few hundred thousands, lived on acorns, held the soil in common, and were free, savage, naked and starving. Now, England contains more

than twelve millions of people, only thirty thousand of whom own property in her soil. This thirty thousand, and probably as many owning capital in other forms, are the exploitators of the rest of her people. They take from them, without paying for it, one-third of the proceeds of their labor. But they keep them at work, make them provident, skilful and civilized, and consequently the two-thirds of the products of the labor of the English peasant, which the land-owner permits him to enjoy, provides him with five times as much of the comforts and necessities of life as were enjoyed by the ancient Britons.

The capitalist wants luxuries, because he has not to labor for them, and makes the largest allowance, or gives the highest wages, to those laborers who possess most skill and produce the most elegant and exquisite luxuries. Thus does exploitation continually advance civilization, by begetting rivalry and competition. In turn, the skilful mechanics, artists, professional men and tradesmen, become exploitators, and levy a much larger tax from the common laborers than they pay to the capitalists. This final process of exploitation combines skill and capital in oppressing and taxing common laborers, and throws the whole burden of society on those least able to bear it. The poor and unskilful underbid each other to get employment, until the competition among them reduces their wages to the starving point and decimates their ranks. It is at this point that, in all naturally-constructed societies, domestic slavery steps in and shields the weaker members of society from the exploitation of the rich and skilful, and the more ruinous consequences of competition among themselves. Domestic slavery arrests exploitation, just when its effects become noxious, and upholds and protects the substratum of society. Competition is a good thing between the members of a superior master race, but ruinous to an inferior race brought into juxtaposition with an inferior one.

That society is in the most healthy, normal, natural, historic and biblical state which combines the slavery to skill and capital with domestic slavery. They are both forms of exploitation, which is a more comprehensive term than slavery. In each case the laborer is deprived (exploited) of part of the products of his own labor.

This is admirably expounded by Stephen Pearle Andrews, a distinguished abolition and socialistic writer of New York, in the following passage :

"The philanthropy of the age is moving heaven and earth to the overthrow of the institution of slavery. But slavery has no scientific definition. It is thought to consist in the feature of chattelism; but an ingenious lawyer would run his pen through every statute upon slavery in existence, and expunge that fiction of the law, and yet leave slavery, for all practical purposes, precisely what it is now. It needs only to appropriate the services of the man by operation of law, instead of the man himself. The only dis-

tion, then, left between his condition and that of the laborer who is robbed by the operation of a false commercial principle, would be in the fact of the oppression being more tangible and undisguisedly degrading to his manhood.

"If, in any transaction, I get from you some portion of your earnings without an equivalent, I begin to make you my slave—to confiscate you to my uses; if I get a larger portion of your services without an equivalent, I make you still further my slave; and, finally, if I obtain the whole of your services without an equivalent, except the means of keeping you in working condition for my own sake, I make you completely my slave. Slavery is merely one development of a general system of human oppression, for which we have no comprehensive term in English, but which the French socialists denominate *exploitation*—the abstraction, directly or indirectly, from the working classes of the fruits of their labor. In the case of the slave, the instrument of that abstraction is force and legal enactments. In the case of the laborer, generally, it is speculation, in the large sense, or *profit-making*. The slaveholder will be found, therefore, upon a scientific analysis, to hold the same relation to the trader which the freebooter holds to the blackleg. It is a question of taste which to admire the most, the dare-devil boldness of the one, or the oily and intriguing propensities and performances of the other."

Now, we have but these objections to the above passage. The master of negroes employs no more of physical force in making his slaves work, than the capitalist in compelling free laborers to work. The master says: "Work, or I will whip you." The capitalist, "Work, or I will starve you." It is a mere difference between "hunger" and "hickories." Yet, as Yankees boast that "free labor is cheaper than slave labor," they, in fact, assert that "hunger" is a more efficacious physical force than "hickories." That is, that the employer or capitalist can exploit more of the results of hired labor than the master can of slave labor; and that, after having exploited it, he need take no other care of the laborer than to pay his poor-rates. Exploitation has taken the place of domestic slavery in all free societies; and exploitation is but a generic term that comprehends slavery of all kinds. All men are, more or less, enslaved who have to pay a tax to others for the use of the earthly elements necessary to human subsistence. If the Confederate States become largely indebted to Europe, they must pay the interest of the debt from their labor bestowed on their own lands, that is; must pay rent to their foreign creditors. In all, save the name, they will be as much slaves as their negroes. The cotton loan, if it succeed, will preserve actual liberty and independence. If it fails, and we become largely indebted in Europe, we shall have only exchanged Yankee masters for European masters.

Yet exploitation, wrong in the abstract, is necessary and right in the concrete and practical. But for it there could be no civilization, no amassing of wealth, no providence for the future. Genius would invent and improve nothing, and labor only provide for daily wants, unless stimulated and necessitated

to continual exertion by the property holders or capitalists, who make it a condition with the poor that they shall work or starve. Proudhon, in the "Resumé et Conclusion" of his "Contradictions Economiques," well remarks :

"Le plus grand sevice que la propriete ait rendu au monde, est cette affliction perpetuelle du travail et du génie."

And again he says, with truth and pathos :

"*Il faut que l'homme travaille ! C'est pour cela que dans les conseils de la Providence, le vol a été instituté, organisé, sanctifié ! Si le propriétaire se fût bientôt lassé de produire, et la sauvagerie, la hideuse misère, étaient à la porte. Le Polynésien, en qui la propriété avorte, et qui jouit dans une entière communauté de biens et d'amours, pourquoi travaillerait il ? Sa terre et la beauté sont à tous, les enfants à personne : que lui parlez-vous de morale, de dignité, de personnalité, de philosophie, de progrès ? Et sans aller si loin, le Corse, qui sous ses châtaigniers trouve pendant six mois le moyen de vivre et le domicile, pourquoi voulez-vous qu'il travaille ? Que lui importent votre conscription, vos chemins de fer, votre tribune, votre presse ? De quoi a-t-il besoin que de dormir quand il a mangé ses châtaignes ? Un préfet de la Corse disait que pour civiliser cette île, il fallait couper les châtaigniers. Un moyen plus sûr c'est de les approprier.*"

Appropriation of the lands by individual owners begets slavery ; and slavery alone begets civilization. The mass of mankind, whether blacks or whites, must be slaves or savages. If they prefer civilization, they have only to choose between "hunger" and "hickories." The ancients preferred hickories, the moderns like hunger best. We think, in the long run, the hickories will carry the day, and domestic slavery, whether with blacks or whites, will be found more merciful and more profitable than the unrestricted exploitation of skill and capital.

ART. XIII.—CONDUCT OF THE WAR.

The mob rules despotically among our enemies. Shall we instal it in supreme power at the South ? So far, our President and all our officers have disregarded the senseless clamor of home-keeping people, who talk and write ignorantly, thoughtlessly and recklessly, about the conduct of the war, which they comprehend about as well as they do the Chaldaic language, or the Egyptian hieroglyphics. Out of danger's way themselves, they do not feel or care for the useless danger to which they would expose our troops. Our officers, whether volunteers or regulars, have exhibited remarkable prudence, caution, skill and sagacity. As conscientious men, they have endeavored to gain victory with little loss of life. In this they have succeeded, because they have fought the enemy at advantage, and never at disadvantage. An army acting on the defensive, in its own territory may, by retreating, choose its own position

for battle. The invading army must either cease to advance, give up its project of conquest, or attack it at disadvantage, in the strong position which it has selected. Where such retreat is conducted in good order, the retreating army gathers strength daily from the surrounding country, and has little difficulty in procuring provisions, because it is always among friends whose resources have not been exhausted.

On the other hand, the invading army rapidly diminishes in numbers, from having daily to detail forces to keep open its line of communication with its base of operations. Besides, with it the difficulty of obtaining provisions increases with each advance. It must procure them from home, from which it is hourly receding; for if the retreating army have not entirely exhausted the supplies of the country through which it has passed, the people are unfriendly, and will not bring into the camp of their enemies the little that is left. If they send out foraging parties this still further weakens them, and exposes them to decimation in detail. Bonaparte set out for Moscow with half a million of men, and if we mistake not, had little over a hundred and fifty thousand when he arrived there. Russia, and the whole of Northern Europe, except Sweden, Norway and Lapland, is a dead level, interspersed with towns and villages. It has no natural strength, and hence, in past times conquest in Europe, with slight exceptions, has proceeded northwardly. The Confederate States present greater natural obstacles to an invading army than any equal area of country on the globe. Armies cannot march down our Atlantic coast, because of the great number of bays, inlets, creeks and rivers; nor down the interior, because of mountain ridges, impassable roads, sparse population, and scarcity of provisions.

The Mississippi is narrow, long, tedious, and easily defended, and its valley is subject to overflow. No invading army will attempt a serious invasion in that direction. It is our true policy to decoy the enemy into the interior, and then to cut them off as were Braddock, and Burgoyne, and Cornwallis, and Ross, and Packenham, and our own troops in the everglades of Florida. When we have defeated and captured their armies, exhausted their treasury, and cowed their spirits by defensive warfare, it will be time for us to begin to act on the offensive and to invade their territory. The northwest is as level a country as Northern Europe, teems with provisions, and abounds with towns and villages. Its population is a spiritless rabble, who have few arms and know little of their use, and who are endowed with no sense of personal or national honor. The northeast rules them with a rod of iron, and, by its protective tariff, robs them of half the proceeds of their labor. They should welcome us as deliverers from Yankee bondage, rather than as conquerors.

Cincinnati and Philadelphia are both weak and tempting

points, and when we have well whipped the enemy within our own territory, it will be time to turn our attention to those cities.

We need not fear that we shall not have abundant opportunities, if we will be but prudent and cautious, to fight them at advantage. They have undertaken to conquer the South, and must advance. In Missouri, Kentucky and northwestern Virginia, we may bide our time and opportunity, select our positions, and fight them only when it is policy to do so. They propose, too, to go to the relief of Eastern Tennessee. Let them try it; when they have marched through Kentucky it will be impossible for them to keep up communication with the North, and their invading army will fall an easy prey to our forces.

We must conquer Washington and Maryland on Virginia soil. McClellan is required by the whole North to advance. He must advance or resign.* If he, or the general who succeeds him, advances, we will be sure to defeat them at Centreville, or Manassas, or at some point between Washington and Richmond. A half dozen defeats would not injure us. A single one would ruin them, and open the way to Washington and Maryland. We must break up their army before we advance into Maryland; and this they will afford us an early opportunity to effect, if we will be but patient.

Should they go into winter quarters in Washington, the North will see that the subjugation of the South is a hopeless project, and the nations of Europe will recognize our independence and break up the blockade. The press and the people of the North see this, and promise, as a dernier resort, a series of brilliant victories, to be achieved by land and by sea within the next few weeks. They must fight us within that time on our own soil and at positions selected by ourselves, and defeat us, too, or the illusion of subjugating the South will pass off from all Northern minds. Invasion alone can subjugate a country; and after nine months of threatening and preparation the North has not advanced ten miles into the well-affected portion of our territory, and has almost lost Missouri, Kentucky, northwestern Virginia and Maryland, which offered them no resistance when the war began. The grand result of their attempted conquest has been, so far, to add a third to the numbers and strength of their enemies.

Many who admit that it is both perilous and useless, so far as ultimate success is concerned, to attempt now to take Washington, who see that so soon as we cross the Potomac we divide our strength, and "have an impassable river behind us and an enemy in superior force before us," contend, nevertheless, that we are in honor bound to attempt the relief of Maryland.

Marching into her territory will be sure to transfer the seat of war from Virginia and carry it into her midst. She is now

comparatively well treated by the federal forces, because they are trying to conciliate her favor, and retain her in the Union. When we attempt to relieve her by crossing the Potomac, we shall place her in the situation of Kentucky, Missouri, Western Virginia and Fairfax. The federalists will burn her farm-houses and villages and towns, and rob and lay waste her whole territory; and her own citizens, divided in their allegiance, will rise up and shed each other's blood. We can imagine no situation more deplorable than would be that of Maryland if we were now to march a part of our army into her territories. The time has not yet arrived when the federals would flee from her soil, panic stricken at our approach; and will not arrive until we have re-enacted on Virginia soil another Manassas. This we shall almost certainly have an opportunity to effect ere winter closes.

Should we be defeated in Maryland, our whole army, with their arms and ammunition, would be captured by the enemy. We might in a short time repair the loss of our men, but the loss of our munitions of war would inflict upon us a stunning and appalling blow. One defeat in Maryland would do us more harm than ten in Virginia. We have the selection of the battle-ground—Why choose Maryland?

We cannot conquer the North except by exhausting it, or by stirring up dissension between the northeast, East and northwest. Our victories but excite their indignation, increase their energies, stimulate them to enlist in the army, and keep down sectional and domestic broils among them. To avoid civil discord, by keeping the people engaged in foreign war, has been the common policy and practice of statesmen in all ages and in all countries. It is thus with the North. She fears the unemployed, destitute, agrarian mob of her large cities, and equally fears a rupture with the northwest. She has to choose between domestic war and war with us. She prefers the latter, and will carry on the war as long as her money or credit lasts. She will hardly be at a loss for men, as the wages she pays to her soldiers are better than those which she gives to her laborers. The prodigious expense which she is now incurring cannot be long continued, unless some rashness on our part enables her to recruit her failing strength from the spoils of the South. The cautious policy and strategy so far pursued by our armies, if persevered in, will insure us against any serious disasters, and gradually and slowly wear away and exhaust the strength and the means of our enemy.

Our soldiers and our officers have exhibited a noble specimen of the moral sublime, in the patience with which they have submitted to misconstruction, calumny and abuse. They prefer to pursue that course which is right, to that which only seems to be right. They will not sacrifice true honor to gain ephemeral reputation. They possess that lofty moral fortitude, that

true courage, that can submit, even to the imputation of cowardice, rather than by failing in duty, to play the actual coward. With what truth and pathos did Scott exclaim (in effect), "I am a coward, because I have permitted popular clamor to swerve me from the line of duty."

It is easier, far easier, to face the cannon's mouth, or mount the deadly breach, than to prefer duty to reputation. Lucretia's virtue satisfies most men; for they are solicitous, not so much for self-approbation as for the applause of the crowd, and are satisfied to do what is wrong, provided they can win the plaudits of the mob. When the future historian records the story of our war, his pen will become most eloquent as he dilates upon that wise, cautious and prudent policy, that, despite of misconstruction, and sacrificing temporary reputation to ultimate success, often won victory by avoiding battle. He will place the men who have pursued this policy upon the highest pedestal in the Temple of Fame, along with Fabius and Washington, for the respect and admiration of endless ages. Horace has already written the appropriate eulogy for all such men, and the occasion is so appropriate that we cannot refrain from quoting a few of his well-known and eloquent lines :

Justum et tenacem propositi virum,
Non civium ardor prava jubentium;

* * * * *

Mente quantit solida.

We had written thus much more than a month ago. Since then, our ministers to England, Slidell and Mason, on their way from a neutral port to England, in an English national mail steamer, have been violently arrested by a federal naval officer, carried North and there detained in prison. This act met with the prompt and cordial approval of the people, the press and the Government of the North; and one of the federal cabinet, in his annual message, went so far as to more than intimate that Captain Wilkes erred in omitting to capture and make prize of the British steamer in which our ministers were found. When the news reached England, the whole nation, from the Queen to the peasant, was stirred up with indignation and anger. A messenger was forthwith despatched to Washington, bearing instructions to Lord Lyons to require a full and explicit apology from the Federal Government, and the release and return to England of our ambassadors.

Will the Government at Washington accede to the demands of England? We thought not; but, not because there is any depth of meanness or cowardice to which the weak, vulgar and perfidious regime at Washington would not descend. But it seems we were mistaken. The arrest of our ambassadors, even with their dispatches, could do no possible good to the North and possible harm to the South. Our commissioners already in Europe were fully competent to treat and negotiate for the

recognition of our independence; and the nations of Europe would not heed diplomacy, however cunning; but would only consult their own interests, and pay regard to our military exploits that proved our ability to sustain our independence, regardless of our professions of such ability, even were they as grandiloquent, as bullying and as boastful as the threats of our adversaries. But one result could possibly follow their discourteous and insulting action, and that was to alienate England more and more from the side of the North, and incline her further to that of the South, toward which her vital interest already most persuasively wooed her. Lincoln, Seward and Cameron, who were always peace men, reluctantly driven by the Northern mob into the war with us, have, from the beginning of their sway, been insulting foreign nations, especially England, legislating to injure them, and sending abroad coarse, crazy fanatics, like Cassius M. Clay, to do dirtier work in the line of insult and vituperation than even they could descend to.

They promised to conquer us ere this, and have not yet begun to invade us. By the admission of Northern men in congress, they have gained no victories and sustained very many defeats. They will be hurled from power, consigned to ignominious disgrace, and probably hung by the Northern mob for their want of success if they continue the war. They must make peace or conquer us.

All the States of our Confederacy have behaved nobly and gallantly throughout our struggle with the populous North. Each has done all that was required or expected of it—all that it had occasion or opportunity to do. We would make no invidious comparisons or distinctions, because there are no facts to justify such comparisons or distinctions. Yet, we are a Virginian in feeling, by birth, by remote descent, and by extensive connections and friendships. We feel peculiarly sensitive to what affects her interests or her honor. She, from her longer line of frontier, her many tide-water navigable rivers, and her vicinity to Washington, has been most exposed, and has had most to bear the brunt of the war. She has made the greatest sacrifices and exertions, simply because she was by her position required to make them. She was the first, and still is the great battle-ground. Soldiers have flocked from every State of the Confederacy to her assistance. She has received them with gratitude, entertained them generously, and fought side by side with them with a chivalry that added lustre to her ancient honor, and only emulated the chivalry of her allies because it was impossible to surpass them.

It is no small distinction to her that she was the first of the border States to secede; and this distinction we shall jealously cherish whilst readily admitting that the secessionists of the other border States were equally brave and patriotic, and only delayed in action by circumstances which they could not con-

trol.' A few, a very few, cavillers have complained of the course of Virginia. It is true that, owing to her vicinity to the North, she has been flooded by treacherous Yankees, who, acting upon the fears and timidity of avaricious, selfish and cowardly natives, have neutralized, for a time, the patriotic action of some of our border counties. But only for a time! The people of Brooke county, in the midst of the Pan Handle, are as true to the South as the people of South Carolina. It is only the people of Wheeling, the lower order of tradespeople, whose Bible is the ledger, who are against us. That class of tradespeople who live for profit, the devotees of Mercury (the god of rogues and merchants), the worshippers of mammon, always go with that side that will pay best. Thank God! we have of this sort of people fewer in Virginia than in any other country on earth. Most of our merchants, imbibing their sentiments, their principles and their morality from the country people, the farming people, are far too honest to succeed as tradespeople. In Virginia we have no trading class in sentiment and principle. The few who take to trade are often ruined by attempting to carry the morality of the country into the counting-room.

Virginia is now, and ever has been, an agricultural State. The farmers give tone and character to society. Her merchants are gentlemen, because they are the sons, friends or connections of farmers. But there is an infamous class of low traders, who, like pickpockets and faro dealers, follow in the wake of armies and of governments. They have crowded to Richmond, and, by cheating everybody who deals with them, have given Richmond a bad name. Her regular merchants, her native-born merchants, are as honorable a body of men as any in the Confederacy. Carry the capital where you will and it will be followed and flooded by pimps, panders, gamblers and cheats. A transient population begets a dishonest class who prey upon it.

The executive of Virginia, her army and her legislature have acted equally well. But for their zealous, able, efficient and concerted action, the glorious results which have attended the campaigns on her soil could not have been attained. Those highest in position and purest in character are most exposed to the malignant shafts of every defamation and detraction: for defamation is a trade which pays best where its victims are noblest. Aristides, the Just, was ostracised,—banished from Athens because he was just.

"He who ascends to mountain tops shall find

The loftiest peaks most wrapt in clouds and snow;

He who surpasses or subdues mankind,

Must look down on the hate of those below.

Though high above the sun of glory glow,

And far *beneath* the earth and ocean spread;

Round him are icy rocks, and loudly blow

Contending tempests on his naked head,

And thus reward the toils which to those summits lead."

The ultra abolitionists are already bitter and active enemies of the Lincoln administration; add to them all honest, brave, consistent and truthful men at the North, who clamorously applauded the act of Capt. Wilkes in taking possession of Mason and Slidell, and who will not now turn round, eat their own words, and basely kneel and knuckle to English threats, and an opposition party will be formed that will paralyze the action of the administration or expel it from power. Lady Macbeth but breathes the voice of natural indignation, when she denounces a like infirmity of purpose—

LADY MACBETH.—“I have given suck, and know
How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me;
I would, while it was smiling in my face,
Have plucked my nipple from its boneless gums
And dashed the brains out, had I so sworn as you
Have done to this.”

ART. XIV.—HUDIBRAS AND PETER PINDAR.

The English press for the last two hundred years has been so prolific of works of considerable merit, both in poetry and in prose, and the tastes and appetites of the reading public have become so greedy for novelty, that many books, deserving a better fate, are out of print, forgotten, and only to be found amongst the lumber of old libraries. This insatiate appetite for novelty is every day consigning meritorious works to comparative oblivion, and bringing into fashion that which has no other claims to admiration except that it is new. The English intellect attained its acme in the days of Elizabeth, and, with a few exceptions of fitful brilliancy, has been declining ever since. Literature was suspended in the days of the revolution and the protectorate that succeeded it; but, in the days of Charles II, revived with a diminished brilliancy; yet, if we include Butler and Milton, with a brilliancy not since equalled. There was a galaxy of erudite writers, both in prose and verse, in Queen Anne's day, whose elaborate finish and chaste style almost made up for their want of thought, power or originality. The distinguished writers under the early part of the reign of George III, avoiding the prim, precise elaboration of the age that preceded them, fell into the opposite error. Finding the field of English thought exhausted, and the prim style of Anne's day unfashionable, under the lead of Johnson, Junius and Burke, they began to invest common places and truisms in scientific terminology and meretricious ornament. We hope this school has died out with Mackintosh and Macaulay, for it was the most vicious that has arisen since the latter days of the Roman and Byzantine empires. Common

sense and familiar thoughts are always excusable and sometimes pleasing, when expressed in plain, simple, ordinary terms; but it is painful in the extreme to be kept on the stretch, searching for a meaning in long, tedious, involved, antithetical sentences; and, when the search is ended, to have our expectations disappointed by seeing a mouse creep out from the mountain in labor.

Byron, alone, presents a striking exception to this general decadence of English literature. He stands next to Shakspeare, not that he added anything whatever to the stock of English thought, but because he dared write what others had only thought. Audacity made him the whale amongst the minnows.

The English novelists, poets and historians of the last half century are, with this exception, probably the most indifferent writers to be found in any age or country, and necessarily so, for the thought of no country was ever before so completely exhausted, by the multitude of its writers, as has been that of England; yet new books are read, because novelty is fashionable, and because the million read, now, who never heard of better books than the last bawdy novel.

Cheap literature begets a low moral and intellectual tone among writers, which reacts upon the readers who patronize it, and thus the public mind, morals and tastes, are continually depraved by the very instruments that, in olden times, elevated and purified them. We, of the South, are happily rid, for the present, of the sluices of debasing stuff that, until now, poured in upon us from the North. Let congress see to it, that it be forever excluded. It is a great misfortune that two neighboring nations speak the same language. The more cunning, enterprising and unprincipled of the two, if they trade together, is sure to impose its habits, customs, fashions and modes of thought upon the other; to cheat and exploit it of its mind and of the fruits of its labor.

The most efficient means to prevent, or at least to mitigate these results, that has yet been suggested, is that proposed by a political economist of this city, our distinguished friend Daniel H. Loudon. His plan, which has been much agitated by the press, is to adopt new standards of weights and measures, and a new, or at least modified, currency; "change," says he, "the language of trade, and you interpose the most efficient barrier to intercourse of all kinds between neighboring nations. God, when He separated mankind into different people and nations, did so by bringing about a variety and confusion of tongues. They could no longer carry on a common project (the building the Tower of Babel) after this event, and soon dispersed themselves into separate nations throughout the earth."

If, in addition to these measures, the South will permit a Southern thought and dialect to grow up, by educating its sons

and daughters at home, from school-books written at home, the novelty of our social and political institutions will gradually beget new and original ideas and theories on all moral subjects, and usher in a literature different from any the world has yet seen. English thought is long since exhausted, and if we follow in its wake we shall be the mere imitators of an effete mind. If we will but look around us and think for ourselves, we have abundant materials at hand from which to build up a new philosophy, a new moral, social and political science, and a new literature.

To return to the subjects of our essay. Hudibras and Peter Pindar are two, out of hundreds of respectable English authors, whom the rage for novelty and the dictates of fashionable criticism and venal puffing have almost consigned to oblivion, by holding up for admiration and substituting in their places very inferior productions.

So far as wit, humor, sarcasm and ridicule are concerned, the merits of these two works are very nearly equal; but the subjects treated of in Hudibras are of a much higher character, and of a deeper and more abiding interest. Individual vices and peculiarities, especially those of George III, are the subjects of the pungent satire and extravagant caricature of Pindar; whilst religious and political sects and parties form the themes for the caustic, learned and philosophic pen of Hudibras. His book might well be entitled "Reformation Run Mad." He graphically describes the excesses of religious zeal, and the absurdities of doctrine that always ensue when men repudiate all human authority; assert and practise, in its utmost latitude, the right of private judgment; attempt to test the truth of the Bible as a *whole* by the dim light of their own learning, and to subject *each text* to the crucible of their fallible reason—or, what is far worse, to make a deity of their consciences, and to accept the written word of God only in so far as it accords with this "new light," this divinity within them. Arrogance, presumption, pedantry and charlatanry were the characteristics of the Puritans of Cromwell's day, as they still are of the Yankees of our time. They will try to "split a hair betwixt the North and Northwest side." Here is an admirable description of a Cambridge scholar, or Yankee teacher, professor or politician, "a bookful blockhead ignorantly read, with loads of learned lumber in his head," a result of the cramming and stuffing system of education, like John Q. Adams and Everett, Cushing and Seward:

"Beside, he was a shrewd philosopher,
And had read every text and gloss over,
What'er the crabb'dest author hath,
He understood by implicit faith;
Whatever sceptic could inquire for;
For ev'ry why he had a wherefore.

Knew more than forty of them do,
As far as *words and terms* could go;
All which he understood by rote,
And, as occasion served, would quote."

This puranical knowledge of mere words and terms is handled by Butler, throughout this work, with the most profound philosophy, for he had seen clear through all systems, ancient and modern, and discovered the fallacy and futility of all; their utter inadequacy to erect a guide in morals, or a substitute for unquestioning religious faith. He had discovered, like Shakspeare, "there are more things in heaven and earth than you e'er dreamt of in your philosophy;" what Pollock said of Byron, "he stoop'd to touch the loftiest thought," may, with much more truth and justice, be applied to Butler. He is continually soaring 'mid the regions of orthodox, established Christian faith, and shooting down ponderous missiles amidst the ranks of philosophic sceptics, and charlatanic Christian rationalists. His theme is a loftier one than Milton's, for Milton was an irreverent, presumptuous Puritan, an Arian, who tested the Bible by his own narrow reason, and sought to prop up Christianity by invoking the aid of philosophy — whilst Butler scorned the puny alliance. Hudibras, viewed aright, is not only the wittiest and most humorous production in our language, but also the most learned and philosophic.

He knew more of logic and metaphysics than Aristotle or Bacon; more of rhetoric than Blair or Longinus; more of grammar than Lindley Murray or the most learned philologist of Oxford or of Germany. They understood names and terms, were deluded by them, and deluded others. He saw and exposed truth, which they had deformed and concealed by overloading it with a useless technical terminology. We will quote a few passages of his poem to elucidate our meaning, and to establish the truth of our propositions:

"And when he happen'd to break off,
In the middle of his speech or cough,
He had hard words ready to show why,
And tell what rules he did it by,
Else, when with greatest art he spoke,
You'd think he talk'd like other folk;
For all a rhetorician's rules
Teach nothing but to name his tools.

* * * * *

He knew what's what, and that's as high
As metaphysic wit can fly;
In school divinity as able
As he that height irrefragable;
A second Thomas, or at once
To name them all, a dunce
Profound in all the *nominal*."

Ralpho. Hudibras' Squire, who values himself upon the "Inner

Light" as a substitute for all learning, thus happily ridicules the philosophy of the schools :

"Quoth Ralpho, nothing but the abuse
Of human learning you produce;
Learning, that cobweb of the brain,
Profane, erroneous and vain;
A trade of knowledge as replete
As others are with fraud and cheat;
An art to encumber gifts and wit,
And render both for nothing fit;
Makes light, unactive, dull and troubled,
Like little David in Saul's doublet;
A cheat that scholars put upon
Other men's reason and their own;
A sort of error to esconce
Absurdity and ignorance;
That renders all the avenues
To truth impervious and abstruse,
By making plain things in debate,
By art perplexed and intricate;
For nothing goes for sense or light
That will not with old *rules* jump right,
As if *rules* were not in the schools,
Derived from *truth*, but *truth* from *rules*."

If our schoolmasters and professors would study Hudibras, they would learn that grammar and rhetoric and lexicography are rules *derived* from language, and do not govern language, but are modified, governed and controlled by the living, everyday language—what they call the "vulgar vernacular." But these are truths which, even had schoolmasters capacity to understand, they would not admit or teach, for more than half their profits accrue from teaching mere "word-learning," which we, like Ralpho, consider something worse than useless lumber of the brain.

Nature alone teaches us how to walk, to talk and to reason; and the dancing-master, the drill-sergeant and the scholastic professor are only useful in so far as they study nature, copy her and enforce her dictates. But they would expel and supplant nature, and we, therefore, say to the whole charlatanic crew of pedagogues, drill-sergeants and dancing-masters, "*Profanum vulgus odi, et arceo!*"

To descend from philosophy to fun, we give a description by Butler of a Yankee officer, brimful of religious zeal, patriotism and Dutch courage, attempting to mount his horse. The prototype of this thing, we are assured, lately occurred in Baltimore, in which Picayune Butler, playing Hudibras, rather over acted his part, from a superfluity of Dutch courage.

"Thus clad and fortified, Sir Knight
From peaceful home set forth to fight,
But first with nimble, active force,
He got on the outside of his horse;

For, having but one stirrup tied
To his saddle, on the farther side,
It was so short he had much ado
To reach it with his desperate toe ;
But, after many strains and heaves,
He got up to the saddle's eaves,
From whence he vaulted into the seat,
With so much vigor, strength and heat,
That he had almost tumbled over
With his own weight, but did recover,
By laying hold on tale and mane,
Which oft he used instead of rein."

To improvise a Yankee cavalry is an absurd attempt. We can only learn to ride and shoot in plastic boyhood. No Southern man recollects the first sparrow he shot, nor his first fall from a horse. Riding and shooting come naturally with us, like talking, cutting teeth and walking; they are prescriptive, beyond the reach of memory, almost congenital. They "come by nature," and if they don't come in infancy never come at all. Teaching a grown-up Yankee to ride is as cruel a procedure as teaching a negro to read or a horse to dance. At milking "keows" and driving oxen he is an adept, but knows nothing, and can learn little, of horse flesh. Indeed, his habits are naturally pacific; and though prone to disputation, to lying, cheating and scandalizing, he never proposes to settle his personal difficulties by the arbitrament of sword or gun, for he feels and heeds the truth of the exclamation of Hudibras :

"Ah me ! what perils do environ
The man that meddles with cold iron."

He likes to shoot at long-taw, and prefers artillery to the bayonet. To accommodate alike his tastes and his fears, McClellan has concluded to have no winter campaign, for artillery could not be dragged over Southern roads in winter, and the Yankee can't be brought to close quarters.

The following picture of metaphorical equitation will apply equally well to Lincoln, Seward, Welles, Cameron, Greeley and Bennett, and the whole host of bullies, cheats and charlatans who have mounted the Northern common weal, and are vainly urging her to invade the South :

"So have I seen, with arm'd heel,
A wight bestride a common weal ;
While still the more he kick'd and spurr'd,
The less the sullen jade had stirr'd."

We were to have been overrun and conquered in the summer, then the affair was postponed to the fall, and next it was discovered that a winter campaign was "the sovereignest thing in the world" for subduing the South. Summer has passed, fall is gone, winter is half over, and Seward's last promise of conquest in ninety days has almost expired, and yet no advance movement on the Potomac line, none in Missouri, none in Kentucky, none on our Southern coast, and none, except mere pil-

fering and marauding expeditions, even in northwestern Virginia, where we have no troops to oppose them. Seward and Lincoln, Greeley and Bennett, in vain kick and spur, threaten, and bribe and promise that "sullen jade," the Yankee army. It remembers Bethel, Bull Run, Manassas, Springfield, Belmont and Leesburg, and will not move an inch to avenge or repeat those terrible defeats.

The limits which we have assigned to ourself forbid us to dwell longer on Butler, and we proceed to notice Dr. Wolcott, the author of *Peter Pindar*. Considerable as is the merit of *Peter Pindar*, it is very inferior to *Hudibras*, which, with scholars and thinking men, will ever rank as one of the best of English books.

All editors should study both books, and keep them on their desks for ready reference. They will suggest much valuable thought, and furnish many apt and telling quotations.

The edition of *Pindar*, before us, is one borrowed from Mr. Randolph's bookstore. It is in three large volumes, contains all Dr. Wolcott's poems, and is admirably printed and gotten up. It was published in Dublin, in 1795. We wonder how so rare and valuable a work could have remained so long unsold. It is Mr. Randolph's only copy.

The chief butts of *Peter Pindar's* wit, humor and satire are George III, Boswell, and the artists of his day. From no book can one gather such accurate notions of the manners, habits, language and little meannesses of King George, as from this. Yet, it is a caricature, and does not do the king justice. He was weak, it is true, almost to idiocy, yet he possessed some judgment and much moral and physical courage. His manners were rough, coarse and boisterous, but his affections were warm and his domestic habits exemplary. He was too economical in small things, but was thoroughly truthful and honest, and did not spare money in maintaining a becoming pageantry of state.

His greatest weakness and most striking peculiarity was a Paul Pry curiosity, that kept him continually meddling with and inquiring into little things, that were beneath the notice or consideration of a king. This peculiarity, a trait common to most weak minds, is often happily hit off in these poems.

In his "Epistle to Boswell," congratulating him on his life of Johnson, he thus writes :

"Pleas'd on thy book, thy sovereign's eyeballs roll,
 Who loves a gossip story from his soul!
 Blest with the memory of the Persian king,
 Who ev'ry body knows and everything;
 Who's dead, who married, what poor girl beguil'd
 Hath lost a paramour and found a child;
 Which gardener hath most cabbages and peas,
 And which old woman hath most hives of bees,
 Which farmer boasts the most prolific sows,
 Cocks, hens, geese, turkeys, goats, sheep, bulls and cows," etc., etc.

The king was a farmer in the small way; raised pigs and poultry, cabbages and turnips, and kept a market-cart. These littlenesses furnish fine subjects for Peter's wit. He hits off this failing of his majesty by the story of a Jewess woman, who carried her son Moses to see a play, but where Moses unfortunately fell and broke his neck before the play began; whereupon the Jewess—

———"being with a saving knowledge bless'd,
She thus the play-house manager address'd:
' Sher, I'm de moder of de poor Chew lad,
Dat meet misfortin here so bad;
Sher, I must have de shilling back, you know,
As Moses haf not see de show.' "

In describing one of those rude, coarse, domestic broils, which were as common it seems at the Courts of the Georges as at that of their kinsman Frederick William of Prussia (all of them being but half-reclaimed barbarians), the poet thus concludes:

"Now, at this sad event the sovereign sore,
Unhappy, could not eat a mouthful more;
His wiser queen, her stomach studying,
Stuck most devoutly to the beef and pudding:
For Germans are a very hearty sort,
Whether begot in hog-styes or in court,
Who bear (which shows their hearts are not of stone)
The ills of others better than their own."

The poet compares Boswell, sustained by the fame of Paoli, whose life he had written, to

"A tomtit twitting on an eagle's back."

Time has falsified the prediction, and now Boswell is the eagle who bears not only Paoli, but also the giant Johnson on his back.

The notorious avarice of Marlborough is exposed by an anecdote, in which the Earl of Peterborough appears in the streets of London and is mistaken by the mob for Marlborough. They take his horses from his carriage and insist on supplying their places, despite of his repeatedly assuring them that he was Peterborough, not Marlborough. As a last resort, he thus exclaims:

"Zounds!" cried the Earl, "he consents, then, this minute."
So, throwing sixpence to them: "There, then, there,
Now if you think I'm he, the devil's in it."

But both Hudibras and Peter Pindar are replete with good things, and justice cannot be done to them by quotation. Everybody should read them.

ART. XV.—ESSAY ON THE MANAGEMENT OF SLAVES.*

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.—History teaches the existence of slavery from the earliest periods of time.

It is at least coeval with the records of human society. It prevailed in all the greatest and most civilized nations of antiquity. The earliest glimpses of Egyptian life exhibit pictures of bondage. The oldest monuments of human labor upon her soil, everlastingly perpetuate both her greatness and the extent of that system of slavery by which such greatness was achieved.

Abraham, the father of the faithful and founder of the Jewish nation, was the purchaser and owner of hundreds of slaves. Babylon and Tyre were markets for the sale of men. The fir trees and cedars of Lebanon were cut and hewed by the *servants* of Hiram, and brought to Joppa in floats by sea; thence carried to Jerusalem by the *servants* of the king of Israel. The temple of Solomon was arrayed in all its glory by the mighty power of this system, directed by the highest wisdom.

In Attica, Laconia, and all the prominent States of classic Greece, the slave population was greater than the free, and the same was true of Rome in her most virtuous days.

Slavery was established and sanctioned by divine authority; and ever since the decree went forth, that the descendants of Canaan should be "servants of servants," slavery has existed in a variety of forms, and in nearly all nations; until now, in the midst of the nineteenth century, we find ourselves the owners of three and a half millions of this peculiar race, without any agency on our part.

Being thus providentially, as it were, endowed with the responsibilities, as well as advantages, which necessarily arise from this foreordained connection of the races, the management and treatment which shall best subserve the welfare and interest of both, becomes one of the most important practical inquiries that can possibly engage our attention.

In attempting an essay upon this subject, we can gather but little aid from the long historical record which we have of the institution, for although we learn that slaves were nearly always employed in labor, we yet see no account of how they were clothed, or fed, or find any data of comparative results of different modes of treatment or labor, whereby we can be guided in our search after a system comprising the greatest benefits. We must, therefore, rely upon the observation, experience and practice of the present time, as the only sources of useful and correct information upon the subject.

The writer has been accustomed to slavery from his earliest days, and for thirty years has been much interested in their management, both on plantations and public works, and has therefore been prompted by his own interests, as well as inclination, to try every reasonable mode of management, treatment, living, and labor: and the results of a long experience has fully satisfied him, and proven beyond doubt, that the best interest of all parties are most promoted by a kind and liberal treatment on the part of the owner, and the requirement of proper discipline and strict obedience on the part of the slave. Indeed, the Creator seems to have planted in the negro an innate principle of protection against the abuse of arbitrary power; and it is this law of nature which imperatively associates the true interest of the owner with the good treatment and comfort of the slave. Hence, abuses and harsh treatment carries its own antidote, as all such cases recoil upon

* By the late Dr. Robert Collins, of Macon, Ga.

the head of the owner. Every attempt to force the slave beyond the limits of reasonable service, by cruelty or hard treatment, so far from extorting more work only tends to make him unprofitable, unmanageable; a vexation and a curse.

It being, therefore, so manifestly against the interest of all parties, as well as opposed to the natural feelings of humanity, and refinement, and the civilization of the age, a case of cruelty or abuse of a slave by his owner, is seldom known and universally condemned.

NEGRO HOUSES.—Among the first objects that occupy the attention of the planter, in the settlement of a new place, is the selection of a proper location for his buildings. This should always be done with great care and with an especial view to health. Good water is indispensable, and should be obtained at almost any cost, as without it there can be no permanent health. It should be obtained from wells or springs, if possible; but if that cannot be done, then proper cisterns should be constructed, and placed to receive the rain water from the buildings, by which means a constant supply of healthy water may be kept on hand.

The houses should be placed, if possible, under the shades of the native forest; but where that cannot be done, the china, or mulberry, or some quick growth should be immediately transplanted, so as to cover the buildings, in some degree, from the rays of the summer's sun. The buildings should be placed about two feet above the ground, so that the air can pass freely under them, and also be well ventilated with doors and windows. They should be sufficiently large, say about sixteen by twenty feet, and but one family should be put in a house: there is nothing more injurious to health or demoralizing in feeling than crowding them together. They had much better sleep in the open air than in crowded, tight houses. Each house or family should be furnished with suitable bedding and blankets, for while a proper outfit costs a few dollars in the beginning, they save twice as much in the end—they add greatly to the comfort and health of the slave, and enable him much better to perform the labor required.

FEEDING OF SLAVES.—In former years the writer tried many ways and expedients to economize in the provision of slaves, by using more of the vegetable and cheap articles of diet, and less of the more costly and substantial. But time and experience have fully proven the error of a stinted policy; and for many years the following uniform mode has been adopted, with much success and satisfaction both to the owner and the slave.

The allowance now given per week to each hand—men, women, boys and girls that are large enough to go in the field to work—is five pounds of good, clean bacon, and one quart of molasses, with as much good bread as they require; and in the fall or sickly seasons of the year, or on sickly places, the addition of one pint of strong coffee, sweetened with sugar, every morning before going to work. These provisions are given out on some designated night of each week, and for families it is put together; but to single hands it is given to each separately, and they then unite in squads or messes, and have their meat cooked for them by a woman who is detailed for that purpose, or keep it to themselves, as they please. Their bread is baked daily in loaves, by a woman who is kept for that duty. Each house or family should have a garden attached for raising their own vegetables.

This mode of allowancing relieves the owner from much trouble in daily supervising their provisions, and is much more satisfactory to the slave. Under this system of treatment, a word of complaint in relation to their living is seldom heard. Some planters, however, differ on this subject, and

prefer the plan of cooking and eating at one common table ; and it is possible, with a small number of hands, and where the owner is willing to devote a good deal of attention to that matter, that he may save a small amount. But it will not be as satisfactory, and he will probably not gain enough to pay for the trouble. Children, of course, must be fed and attended as their wants require : they are not likely to be neglected, as they pay a good interest upon the amount of care and expense bestowed upon them.

NEGRO CLOTHING.—The proper and usual quantity of clothes for plantation hands, is two suits of cotton for spring and summer, and two suits of woollen for winter ; four pair of shoes and three hats, which, with such articles of dress as the negro merits, and the owner chooses to give, make up the year's allowance. Neatness in dress is important to the health, comfort and pride of a negro, all of which should be encouraged by the owner. They should be induced to think well of themselves ; and the more pride and self-respect you can instill into them, the better they will behave, and the more serviceable they will be : so they should always be aided and encouraged in dressing, and their own peculiar fancies indulged to a reasonable extent.

HOURS OF WORK.—In the winter time, and in the sickly season of the year, all hands should take breakfast before leaving their houses. This they can do and get to work by sunrise, and stop no more until twelve o'clock ; then rest one hour for dinner, then work until night. In the spring and summer, they should go to work at light and stop at eight o'clock for breakfast, then work until twelve o'clock and stop two hours for dinner, and work from two o'clock till night. All hands stop on Saturday at twelve o'clock, and take the afternoon for cleaning up their houses and clothes, so as to make a neat appearance on Sunday morning.

TASK WORK.—The usual custom of planters is to work without tasks during the cultivation of their crop ; but in gathering cotton, tasks are common, and experience has proven that whenever work is of that kind or character that it can be properly parcelled out into tasks, it is much better to do so. If the overseer has judgment he will get more work, and the negro will be better satisfied : he will generally make an effort, and gain time, to devote to his own jobs or pleasures.

NEGRO CROPS.—It was at one period much the custom of planters to give to each hand a small piece of land to cultivate on their own account, if they chose to do so ; but this system has not been found to result well. It gives an excuse for trading, and encourages a traffic on their own account, and presents a temptation and opportunity, during the process of gathering, for an unscrupulous fellow to mix a little of his master's produce with his own. It is much better to give each hand, whose conduct has been such as to merit it, an equivalent in money at the end of the year ; it is much less trouble, and more advantage to both parties.

DISCIPLINE.—In regard to the general management or discipline on plantations or public works, it is of great consequence to have perfect system and regularity, and a strict adherence to the rules that may be adopted for the government of the place. Each hand should know his duty, and be required to perform it ; but, as before intimated, the owner has nothing to gain by oppression or over driving, but something to lose ; for he cannot, by such means, extort more work. But still, if it becomes necessary to punish the negro for not doing his duty, or the violation of rules, it does not make him revengeful, as it would an Indian or white man, but it rather tends to win his attachment and promote his happiness and well-being. Slaves have no respect or affection for a master who indulges them over-

much, or who, from fear, or false humanity, fails to assume that degree of authority necessary to promote industry and enforce good order. At the same time, proper and suitable indulgences and privileges should be granted for the gratification and amusement of the negro; but they should always be exercised by special permission, for they are a people ever ready to practice upon the old maxim of "give an inch and take an ell."

Negroes are by nature tyrannical in their dispositions; and if allowed, the stronger will abuse the weaker; husbands will often abuse their wives, and mothers their children, so that it becomes a prominent duty of owners and overseers to keep peace, and prevent quarrelling and disputes among them; and summary punishment should follow any violation of this rule.

Slaves are also a people that enjoy religious privileges. Many of them place much value upon it, and to every reasonable extent, that advantage should be allowed them. They are never injured by preaching, but thousands become wiser and better people, and more trustworthy servants, by their attendance at church. Religious services should be provided and encouraged on every plantation. A zealous and vehement style, both in doctrine and manner, is best adapted to their temperament; they are good believers in mysteries and miracles; ready converts, and adhere with much pertinacity to their opinions when formed.

No card playing or gambling of any description should be allowed, under severe penalties. And the Maine liquor law should be rigidly enforced on every estate.

MARRYING AMONG SLAVES.—Taking wives and husbands among their fellow servants at home, should be as much encouraged as possible; and although intermarrying with those belonging to other estates should not be absolutely prohibited, yet it is always likely to lead to difficulties and troubles, and should be avoided as much as possible. They cannot live together as they ought, and are constantly liable to separation in the changing of property. It is true they usually have but little ceremony in forming these connections; and many of them look upon their obligation to each other very lightly; but in others, again, is found a degree of faithfulness, fidelity and affection which owners admire; and, hence, they always dislike to separate those manifesting such traits of character.

SICKNESS.—Proper and prompt attention, in cases of sickness, is a vastly important matter among slaves. Many plantations are inconvenient to medical aid, therefore owners and overseers should always understand the treatment of such common cases as usually occur on places under their charge. This is easily done, and many times a single dose of some mild and well understood medicine, given at the beginning of a complaint, removes the cause and effects a cure at once, when delay or neglect might render it a serious case. A few common medicines, with plain and proper directions pasted on each bottle, should be kept on all plantations.

A bountiful supply of red pepper should be cultivated and kept on hand, and used freely, in damp sections, where sore throats are apt to prevail, and also in all fall complaints. It acts by creating a glow over the whole body, without any narcotic effect; it produces general arterial excitement, and prevents, in a considerable degree, that languor and apathy of the system which renders it so susceptible to chills and fevers; it may be given in any way or form which their taste or fancy may dictate.

ART. XVI.—WHAT WE ARE GAINING BY THE WAR.

The following are a few of the replies which were elicited by a circular recently issued from Richmond. They are placed in our hands for public use, and indicate a general industrial movement throughout the Confederacy which must be gratifying in the last degree. Let but the war continue a year or two longer, and it will be found that the mineral and manufacturing developments of the South will be little less striking than have been its agricultural. Our people require but the field. They have all the energy, industry and ingenuity which is necessary to success, and are now showing it.

The remainder of the letters will appear in other articles, as will also those which may be received hereafter. We invite contributions of the sort from every quarter.

It will be noted that the replies are mainly from villages and towns. The facts from Richmond, Charleston, Savannah, Nashville, Mobile, New Orleans, Memphis, etc., are not yet ready to be presented, and more information is desired from each.

We have only space to begin the publication in this number of the Review, but will devote many pages to it in coming numbers.

VIRGINIA.

NORFOLK, VA.—New branches of manufacture in the City of Norfolk since the commencement of the war:

Anderson & Murray—Sawed Block Friction Matches: ten hands employed. Geo. F. Autten—Bits, Buckles and Swingle Trees. Andrew Myers—Bits and Stirrups. B. Rayton—Drumheads and Musical Instruments. A. Young—Essence of Coffee. A. Leyburn—Brass Cocks and Engine Fixtures. Dilworth, Brooks & Dogherty—Tannery: thirty hands. Jas. H. Reed—Spurs, Bits and Stirrups. Davidton Morris—Brass and Silver Letters, Bugles, Cross Cannon, Cross Sabres, Figures and Stars. Geo. W. Bluford—Currying and Finishing Leather: five hands. Geo. W. Griggs—Candles. Matthew Dugan—Candles. Bull & Douglass—Camp Cots. Boots and Shoes: ten hands.

Branches of manufacture in the City of Norfolk, existing before the war and enlarged since:

Charles Harris—Bread and Biscuit Bakery. Seth March—Agricultural Instruments and Gun Carriages. John E. Doyle—Rope-walk and Grist-mill. F. W. Seabury's Sons—Boots and Shoes. Jno. F. Wilkins—Boots and Shoes. R. H. Stevens—Hats and Caps. J. D. Reed—Hats and Caps. Wm. A. Graves—Ship-builder, Gun Carriages. Nath'l Nash—Shipbuilder. John Croel—Blocks and Pumps. A. J. Ogilvie & Co.—Blocks and Pumps. Lewis Salusbury—Cabinet Maker. J. J. Tompkins & Co.—Cabinet Maker. Griffin Barnes—Sashes, Blinds and Doors. Sam'l Charlton—Carts and Drays. Wm. J. Holmes—Carts and Drays. A. Wren—Coaches and Harness. John Gormley—Saddles and Harness. Atlantic Iron Works—Foundry (extensive). Rowland & Brothers—Soap and Candles (extensive). Martin Greenwood—Soap. Geo. L. Crow—Tin Canteens and other Tin Ware. D. D. Hitchings—Boatbuilder.

NORFOLK, VA.—(From J. E. Doyle.)—I have in the City of Norfolk a factory for the manufacture of cordage, oakum, and the grinding of corn into meal and hominy—all driven by steam.

The rope department had been discontinued previous to the war, as it was not sustained by our own dealers. This department had been in active operation for fifty years in my family, and I have made the rigging for one half the ships now in the federal service. It is the only rope-walk in the Confederacy of its class. It can be put to work at a moderate expense, capable of serving all the requirements of the Confederacy for some time to come. I know no other person in this Confederacy understanding the business but myself.

The oakum factory is now in operation. In this, also, have I supplied the navy of the late United States at all their principal dock-yards. It is capable of turning out one ton per day; it is also the only factory of the kind south of New Jersey.

In addition to the foregoing, I some two years since put in operation a grist-mill, now supplying, to a considerable extent, the commissary department, at Norfolk, with meal. I can grind, say one hundred and twenty bushels each ten hours.

The principal buildings are of brick. The whole establishment cost me over twenty-five thousand dollars. If our Government desire to foster the manufacture of cordage and oakum, I know no point where it can be made available, except at Norfolk.

NORFOLK, VA.—(Seabury & Son.)—We employ thirteen hands, exclusive of the foreman or cutter.

Have made, in about the three months we have been operating, little over two thousand dollars worth of first-class shoes for gent's wear.

Besides the above, we have made up, say from three to four hundred common trunks and valises, worth, say between six and eight hundred dollars.

GOOCHLAND, VA.—The dulcet notes that our *females* are discoursing on spinning-wheels and hand-looms, though sweet to Southern ears, would, if heard beyond the Potomac, sound more like a funeral knell to their dear, defunct Southern trade, than otherwise.

FAUQUIER CO., VA.—(Homer Holland, M. D.)—MINERAL RESOURCES OF THE SOUTH.—The soil of most of the States, being moist and warm, has many of its mineral elements rapidly transforming, which renders them soluble and they are lixiviated out; such is more especially the case with lime—one of the most prominent constituents, in all its combinations, of a fertile soil. Cotton, tobacco and all the cereals require this potent element, and it exists in inexhaustible deposits as shells, marls, coprolites and corals, which, although not as immediately stimulant and exhaustible as the several ammoniacal and phosphatic guanos and the factitious fertilizers imported, they can be more extensively and cheaply procured and employed. On the Potomac, at the junction of the cretaceous strata at Marlborough, and at Shell Bluff, in Georgia, there is enough for ages, and it only requires that specific attention be directed to these magazines of fertility. Ed. Ruffin, a generation since, published his views of shells and marls, which seem to have attracted, practically, more attention to the matter in the North and in England than in the Gulf States, where these valuable fossils abound, and are of more value and extent than elsewhere on the globe. Mr. Ruffin is unquestionably partly responsible for this neglect, for he engaged in collecting and grinding bones and manipulating sundry fertilizers, inferior to the fat marls of Acquia and Potomac creeks, and those near Augusta and Savannah, Georgia. If appealed to, he will confirm my incontrovertible statement.

Relative to the other important catalytic action and effect of the lime in forming, in our climate, the nitrates, and the important part they play nascently in vegetable circulation and growth. They are accumulated in sheltered localities and caves in Tennessee, especially on the eastern escarpment of the Cumberland mountains, and perhaps in other Southwestern States, to which our authorities should give immediate and special attention, as they are and will continue to be the great source from which the nitrate of potassa (saltpetre) should at all times be made, by simply boiling together this natural nitrate of lime with the salts of potassa, from the solution of wood ashes, and crystalizing out and purifying by recrystallization. The insoluble salts of lime by the known laws (chemical) of combination and commutation being very exact, simple and potent. The nitrates, during and previous to the war of 1812, were profitably made in Kentucky and Tennessee; and why they were not continued, is only to be accounted for by diversion of enterprise to agriculture. This industry should be renewed, as the French and Germans make it a national industry; and it is extensively practised in India, where most of our nitrate of potassa comes from, and the ashes of dried weeds are used in absence of wood ashes. India itself is not as prolific in the nascent nitrates as the region named, and I hope you will address Jas. M. Safford, of Lebanon, Tennessee (of *his first Geological Report*, through his courtesy, I had a copy in North Carolina in 1856, and called his attention to the nitrates natural of his State, and presume he took cognizance.)

You will, I hope, early, give us a synopsis of the vast metallic minerals of our State, and in this you can consult the published surveys of Alabama, Mississippi and South Carolina, by my friend O. M. Lieber, Esq., that of Professor E. Emmons, my immediate friend and correspondent, now on the reconnoissance of North Carolina. He will give you an epitome, on solicitation, of especial value; and I should not forget to mention the report of Missouri, of which I have seen only an extract, having no means of procuring a copy. This State has the richest and most extensive trace of minerals in the known world—something like eighteen millions of acres—and within a few months an auriferous sulphide of copper has been found, or rather the gold in it has been discovered, which exceeds any heretofore known.

The gold and silver ores are generally unknown in the several States of our Confederacy, simply for the absence of science and skill to test them chemically and treat them metallurgically. Resolving these metals when combined with elements and other complicated metals, especially sulphur, titanium, etc.

Various Northern companies have speculated in mines, and expended millions on worthless mines and more worthless machinery, without first consulting educated men from the French mining-schools, but in their stead, putting in place, at high salaries, cornish miners, who are qualified only in collieries, and are ignorant of the

rudiments of geology, mineralogy and chemistry. Put them to work as miners and metallurgists of gold and silver!

There necessarily is in England and most of Europe, a great and innocent ignorance of metallurgy in gold and silver. The consequence of all mining enterprises for the very desirable and precious metals, gold and silver, is problematical, and thus mining and metallurgy, from the experience obtained, is looked upon generally as uncertain, if not visionary.

N. B.—When, with exact chemical metallurgy and fixtures, there is not in the “*exposés*” of the world a more sure and legitimate source of industry and wealth than may now be opened up by the citizens of the Confederate States of America, without foreign capital, or miners, metallurgists, or chemists. This I have demonstrated in Charlotte, N. C., on the mine of Judge Jas. W. Osborne, and as my friend and life acquaintance, Professor E. Emmons, can fully certify. At some future day I may write an epitome of the metals, gold and silver, how they were secreted, and in combination, and associated in veins; how these have been transformed and decomposed, and their gold and silver, in some instances, metalized to a limited extent, but still are combined, obscure and mineralized. My patented devices are not fully completed, but the stultified act of these Confederate States nullified my patents, which I, a citizen of North Carolina, will not renew and publish until the act, in limine, is revised, and secures something besides litigation to the patentee and inventor.

SUFFOLK, VA.—A large majority of families in this country have made or manufactured on their farms, clothing for their servants, including shoes. I think I may safely say, more than double as much cloth has been manufactured this year as has in any previous year for twenty years past. There has been made in this town, for the special use of the soldiers who have gone from this county, four hundred pair shoes, and the making will continue until each soldier is furnished with a pair. The cost of the shoes and making will be paid by the county.

LEXINGTON, VA.—We have had a considerable change in our manufacturing interests since the Yankee blockade commenced, and a change, I am happy to believe, that is much for the better. We are fast coming back to the good old homespun system. In the important article of wearing apparel, our people have fallen back upon their home resources. The family spinning-wheel and loom have been resurrected from their hidden corners, brushed up, and set to work again. Jeans, linseys and flannels are now made by private families in considerable quantities, and of much superior quality to articles of the kind we formerly got from the Yankees. Our people are taking pride in obtaining and wearing homespun suits, and feel finer and far more comfortable therein than they used to do in imported broadcloths. The attention of our farmers is turned to the raising of sheep for the sake of the wool; and by another year we shall have a good deal larger supply of that valuable article. We have a woolen factory near this place, which, this fall, has turned out an unusually large quantity of cloths, flannels, blankets, etc. It has supplied much material for soldiers’ clothing, and much more for neighborhood wear. A new impetus has been given to this business since the beginning of the war.

In the article of leather, preparations are going on for a large increase in the manufacture thereof. The old tanneries are enlarging their business, and new ones are springing up. This section is tolerably well supplied with bark for tanning purposes, and as the business is now considered quite profitable, the attention of capitalists, and those who know anything of the business, is being turned in that direction. They can buy hides in Richmond or other distant markets, and tan them at a handsome profit, not only for the home market, but also to send off again to market. We now look to the home manufacture for boots and shoes—ladies’ wear to some extent as well as gentlemen’s—and although articles in that line have been scarcer and higher than formerly, yet our people are pretty well supplied, and the business is improving at a rate which will soon insure an abundant supply.

In iron-manufacturing resources, the materials in this region are inexhaustible. Our mountains are full of iron ore. A few years back we had seven or eight furnaces in this county, which could have extended their business in proportion to the demand for iron, but several of them were suspended owing to the decline in the demand and price of iron. We have had quite a number of forges in operation also, some of which are still going. The increasing price and demand for iron is again calling attention to its manufacture, and we may soon expect to see it largely increased.

The very high prices now paid for whiskey has produced quite a fever for its manufacture, and large quantities of grain are bought up, and distilleries in abundance are called into requisition for making the “old mountain rye.”

EDITORIAL.

CONVENTION OF THE PLANTERS OF THE SOUTH.—We publish below a circular addressed to the planters of the South, by Col. Thomas J. Hudson, the President of the Planters' Convention, which was to have been held at Memphis on the 16th of December, but was postponed until the third Monday in February. In this circular it is urged that the different States appoint full delegations to this Convention. Some of them have already done so, and it is important that the others should act, in view of the near approach of the time for the Convention to assemble. It is also urged that the commercial and manufacturing interests of the Southern cities should be represented—a wise recommendation, the business connection between these classes and the planters being necessarily intimate.

PLANTERS' CONVENTION OF THE SOUTH.

To the Delegates appointed to the Planters' Convention at Memphis, on the third Monday in February, and to the Planters of the Confederate States:

The third annual session of the "Planters' Convention of the South," was to have assembled in the City of Memphis, Tenn., on the 16th of December. Circumstances made it advisable to postpone this meeting until the third Monday in February, when it is hoped every delegate appointed will be in attendance.

The number of able and distinguished gentlemen already appointed by the legislatures and executives of the several States, justifies the belief that the approaching session is to be one of the most interesting assemblages ever held in the South.

The first Planters' Convention convened at Nashville, Tennessee, October 10th, 1859. The second annual session was held in Mississippi, October 16th, 1860. At the last session, a plan of permanent organization was adopted; its declared

"object being to secure, by united action of the Southern people and States, the advancement of the agricultural, manufacturing and commercial interests of the South."

The overthrow of the old and the establishment of the new government, compels the Southern planter to abandon the suicidal policy of the past. It will be for this Convention, composed of delegates from every congressional district, and representing the great and leading interest of the Confederate States, after a free and full interchange of views, to inaugurate that system of policy best calculated to promote their own and their country's prosperity. Here the tobacco, corn, wheat, rice, sugar and cotton producer will meet in council. A common country to sustain, common interests to promote, we can, by united action, do much to advance the political and commercial independence of the South.

While agriculture is acknowledged as the great basis of the social, political and commercial power, we must remember that the prosperity of our manufacturing and commercial interests are essential to our future greatness, and we should, therefore, secure the cordial operation of those engaged in these pursuits.

The war now being waged in defence of the great principles of self-government, must end, sooner or later, in placing the Confederate States among the great nations of the world. With a territory almost boundless; soil rich and fertile; productions the most valuable; a climate adapted to the growth of almost everything desired by man; a labor system best suited to our climate and productions, and a people united in feeling and in interest, we have all the elements that constitute a great and powerful nation. To secure political independence, we confidently rely upon the brave hearts and strong arms of our gallant army. But, to make the triumph of Southern arms more valuable to the present and future generations, it is necessary that all our efforts should be directed to the development of our great resources. No more

dependence upon Yankee brains or Yankee hands, is and must be the watchword of every true-hearted Southerner; and that statesman who will indicate the best policy to be adopted, will win laurels as unfading as the chieftain who drives the invader from our soil.

It is unnecessary here to allude to the many questions suggested for the consideration of the Convention. The legislatures of several States have adopted resolutions in reference to the planting of another crop of cotton—the crop of this year being still in the hands of planters. By the third Monday in February, the planters, in Convention, will be better prepared to adopt a course of policy dictated by the circumstances that may then surround us.

No delegate, it is hoped, will be absent from this great council of planters. Every planter who appreciates his own and the condition of his country, should feel it his duty to have his congressional district represented.

To have each State properly represented in the standing committees, it is desirable that the undersigned should be furnished with a list of delegates at the earliest moment.

THOMAS J. HUDSON,
President Planters' Convention.
LAMAR, Miss., December 11, 1861.

The first Congress of the Confederate States, under the Permanent Constitution, will be composed of twenty-two Senators and eighty-seven Representatives.

The representation will be as follows, being in the ratio of one member for every ninety thousand of population, on the federal basis, counting three-fifths for slaves.

We add, in a separate column, the electoral vote of each State in the Confederacy:

	<i>Representation.</i>	<i>Votes.</i>
Virginia.....	16	18
North Carolina.....	10	12
South Carolina.....	6	8
Georgia.....	10	12
Florida.....	9	4
Alabama.....	9	11
Louisiana.....	6	8
Texas.....	6	8
Arkansas.....	4	6
Mississippi.....	7	9
Tennessee.....	11	13
	87	109

The House, as constituted now, is com-

posed, therefore, of eighty-seven members, and the whole electoral vote is one hundred and nine. This last number will not be altered between this time and the election next month. The number of the House may be increased by the secession of new States before the meeting of Congress in February. There are some States which may be in the Confederacy then.

The Hon. John Perkins, member of Congress from Louisiana, in a private letter, thus discourses upon the importance of a discriminating policy in our commercial relations, in order that the Yankees may not after peace resume their former industrial dominion over us. The subject is certainly worthy of deep reflection in all its bearings. He says:

“Political independence without commercial independence, will be an abstraction. For some minds, it is difficult to realize the fact that, in attaining an independent nationality we are to establish, at the same time, a distinct individuality. Our domestic and foreign policy must not and cannot be, in the nature of circumstances, a mere imitation of that of the old Government. Our true interest requires a closer alliance, through commercial treaties, with European nations, than with a rival nation at our side. For one, I desire in the future none but the most restricted and necessary intercourse with the people of the Northern States. We will differ from them in the character of our institutions, in our moral code, in the habits and feeling of our people, and instead of assimilation, I would encourage not an antagonistic, but an entirely distinct and different development and national character. To this end, should England and France recognize our independence, I would think it wise to discriminate for a limited period, after the termination of the war, in favor of their vessels and manufactured articles. I would not surrender the right, under a commercial treaty, to impose such duties as we please upon foreign importations; but should consider it no loss of self-respect to agree with England or France, in consideration of their exposing themselves to a war with the United States by raising the present blockade, to tax, for a limited period after the termination of the war, articles of Northern manufacture or imports in Northern vessels, ten or even twenty per cent. higher than sim-

ilar goods of European manufacture. For the last twenty years the Northern States have lived upon the resources of the South. We have paid an annual tribute of millions in support of their fisheries, thus building up for them the marine which now infests our coasts. By a system of navigation laws, we have permitted them to beggar our own maritime ports in building up the great cities of the North. Add to this, under a sentiment of national pride, we have fostered their manufactures at the expense of all other nations.

Under these circumstances, a discrimination against them to the extent of ten or twenty per cent. would be, in effect, only placing them on an equality with other nations. They live immediately along our border; they understand the character of our wants; our people are in the habit of purchasing from them; our merchants have always had credit with them; our foreign importations have always been made through them, and by agencies in their midst they have credit abroad which we have not yet secured.

Should peace be established to-morrow, without the creation of some such legislative barriers as I have indicated, old channels of trade would revive, agents of Northern manufacturers would infest our cities, a cheap and inferior article of Northern manufacture would preclude the introduction of the superior, substantial European article, and at once and forever prostrate those incipient manufactures which are now, under the impulse of patriotism and the public want, springing up in every part of the South. Nor can we be properly charged with vindictive feeling in the legislation I propose. Our first action in the Montgomery congress was to send commissioners to treat with the Northern States in the most liberal and friendly spirit. Our commissioners were contemptuously refused an audience. Our next action was to send similar commissioners to European nations. Should the politeness with which these representatives have been listened to ripen into cordial sympathy, and then into actual recognition of our existence as an independent nation, I do not think it would be unwise in us to respond to their friendly disposition by the formation of treaties of the character I have indicated."

As one of the most interesting incidents of the day, and part of the history of the times, we refer to the taking of the

oath of allegiance to the Confederate States by the Hon. Thomas B. Monroe. The Judge is a Virginian by birth, and a near relative of the late President Monroe. In viewing his dignified and venerable person, and listening to his eloquent, learned and philosophic language, one is equally reminded of the Grecian sage and the Roman senator. Kentucky deserves the thanks of the Confederacy for selecting him as one of her congressional delegation. The Hon. Thomas B. Monroe, late of Kentucky, appeared in Court and said:

"If the Court please: It is agreed, we know, by all jurists and men of common sense, that the obligations of protection by the Government and allegiance of the citizens or subjects are reciprocal and dependent; and that, therefore, whenever the Government has ceased to afford the protection, the obligations of obedience and support by the citizens no longer exists, and the body of the people have the inalienable right to revolt, and having accomplished the revolution, may adopt the new Government, which they believe will best insure the protection of their rights and promote their welfare; or any proper portion of the people may separate themselves and the territory they occupy—"secede"—and form such new Government within their own dominion as they think proper; or any number of such oppressed people may emigrate and adopt themselves citizens of any other Government. The Government of the United States ceased to afford protection to its citizens. In Kentucky every right of life, liberty and property has been there ruthlessly violated, by both lawless men and the Government itself, and a despotism avowedly established worse than any heretofore known in the history of the world. In the worst of the oriental and Northern despotisms, even the autocrat is bound, at his peril, to observe certain established customs; but in Kentucky all usage is ignored, and the rights of men violated in the most aggravated and insulting modes. In this state of affairs I elected to extirpate myself and emigrate, and I resigned the office I held under the Government, and departed its territory. In doing this, having the right to choose the country of my adoption, I chose the 'Confederate States.' I was born within their territory, I approve their constitution and institutions, admire their people and their statesmen, and I believe

that the composition and character of their people, and position and circumstance of their country are such, that it may be confidently expected their public affairs will always be administered by high, honorable and able men.

I have unbounded confidence in their ability to maintain their independence, and that here will be performed all the duties of a good Government to its citizens. I am, therefore, ready to take the oath to support the constitution of the Confederacy, and of allegiance to it."

Confederate Primer.

First Confederate Speller.

Second Confederate Speller.

These little works, edited by an association of Southern teachers, and published at Nashville, Tenn., have been laid upon our desk. They are the harbingers of a new era which we are glad to hail. The Confederate States will very shortly be supplied with their whole school series by native writers and native presses. The little works before us are well deserving of patronage.

Many thanks to our friends and publishers, Evans & Cogswell, of Charleston, for a copy of their excellent *pocket Map of the Seat of War in South Carolina and Georgia*, which is lithographed in a style not often surpassed by the Yankee press. These gentlemen are among the most enterprising among us. They have added to their extensive printing establishment and bindery all the most expensive materials necessary in lithographing, and are prepared to issue every description of work in the most complete style. See their advertisement on another page.

Free Trade and Direct Taxation are growing more and more popular every day, throughout the Confederate States. Says a friend in Virginia, by letter:

"I had fondly hoped, when we separated from Yankeedom, we should have been relieved of that odious system of (robbery) unjust and unequal taxation; under it, no one knows what he pays toward the support of Government; and, therefore, seems to care nothing about it, unless it is being handled by some worth-

less, heartless demagogue, for political effect, and he, at the same time, more corrupt than those he attacks. As to the inequality, I hardly suppose there can be a doubt on the mind of any one who has ever thought upon the operation of it. There are numbers not worth five hundred dollars, who have actually had to contribute more than others worth their half million or more; and, then, the collection of duties by one half the collectors to be paid to another (to say nothing of the villanous rascality and corruption practiced by them and their subordinates), for in this collection district, which has cost the Government from fifteen hundred to two thousand dollars per annum, there has not been collected in the last thirty years, I will venture to say, two thousand dollars revenue; and this, I imagine, is a fair sample of many hundred others; indeed, I have doubted whether the revenue collected in the Richmond district in three years would pay for the custom-house erected there. Let us have equal and *ad valorem* taxation; every man to pay according to what he is worth, and to *know* what he pays for the support of his Government, and *free trade* with all the world except Yankee-doodledom—and with regard to them, *no trade*; but whatever is brought thence into the Confederacy, *utter and immediate confiscation*. And to insure that, the appropriation of the whole amount confiscated, after paying costs, to the informer. The great bugbear of direct taxation seems to be two sets of tax collectors; that, I should suppose, might be obviated by assessing each State its proportion of the tax, and let them have it collected with the State taxes by the sheriffs. I trust you will press the matter urgently.

We had an excellent article very recently in the Review, upon the subject of *Woman's Mission, Education*, etc., from the pen of Mr. Fitzhugh, and now add an extract from a letter recently received by us, from an intelligent lady in Texas, upon the same subject:

"I am no advocate for 'woman's rights' in the present acception of the term, but I contend that she is entitled to equal advantages of mental culture, and the selfishness of man should not withhold them from her. What was the object of her creation? *Emphatically* to be a *helpmeet and companion* for man. Her's is a higher destiny than to be merely the slave of his caprice, or an instrument of pleasure. If her creation was *but* for his

pleasure, then why was she endowed with a mind capable of such a high degree of culture and expansion? Why was she endowed with the same attributes of thought and feeling? It is because the Creator intended her to be his *equal*—his *companion*—to share his destiny in time and eternity.

I will agree that woman is physically man's inferior. Her physical powers are not the same, nor is it *necessary* that they should be. Her *true* position in life does not demand it; though, in spite of this inferiority, the selfishness of man in barbarous nations and countries has compelled her to bear the hardships and drudgery of life, while to his lot fell the pleasures and comforts. But as the golden chariot of civilization rolls forward, we see woman gradually rising from her degraded position and asserting her equality. Her mind is gradually being emancipated from the thralldom of ignorance and superstition, and will, ere long, shine out one of the brightest ornaments in the crown of our new-born republic.

I am glad to see that Southerners are beginning to feel the importance of cultivating her mind to a greater extent than has heretofore been attempted. And I do hope that the superficiality pervading our Southern female schools will be entirely done away with, and that the young female minds of the present generation will receive advantages of a sterling quality, and be cultivated thoroughly and substantially. When we have *thoroughly* educated *mothers*, we may reasonably hope that, in future, our country may be governed by *men* of sterling qualities. For where is the true mother who does not delight in improving and cultivating the minds of her offspring to the extent of her power? It is inherent in her nature; it is one of the first attributes of motherhood. I am a woman, and deplore the false opinions that have so long kept us in the background, and refused us the training of mind that is actually requisite for the mothers of the human family.

It is strange, passing strange, that so many centuries have elapsed and woman has made no effort to assume her true position in the creation, unless it can be summed up in the following words of the prisoner of Chillon:

'My very chains and I grew friends.
So much a long communion tends
To make us what we are; even I
Regained my freedom with a sigh.'

THE LEATHER TRADE—IMPROVEMENT
IN TANNING.—We find in our Southern

exchanges very favorable notices of two new processes for "tanning leather"—or rather, we should say, for tanning hides and skins, leather being the result of the tanning process. The Savannah News speaks of a new process of tanning invented by Mr. Boothby, of the firm of Boothby, Savage & Co., of that city, whose tannery has been in existence about eight months. By their patent process they are enabled to tan and finish leather, from the lime, in from fifteen to sixty days, according to the size and weight of the skins. The News says:

"In their vats and in the process of finishing, we saw sole and harness leather, kip, calf, sheep, goat and alligator skins. The finished calf skins, sheep skins, and other upper leather submitted to our inspection, appeared to be well and thoroughly tanned, being remarkably smooth, soft and pliable. Shoemakers who have made up the leather, speak very favorably of it; and, as far as an opportunity has been afforded here to test its wearing qualities, it has proved very satisfactory.

The new process of tanning, besides being very quick and economical, is very simple in its operation. The cost of putting a tannery in operation is much less than is required by the old system, and the process is so simple that, with a little instruction in tanning and dressing leather, plantation hands could carry on a tannery in all departments, and produce good leather.

Mr. Isaac Bierfield, of Newbury Court-house, South Carolina, has also invented a new process of tanning, viz: with a weed called the 'dog fennel,' for which he has obtained a patent. He claims that he can 'tan and make better leather, in one-third less time, with one-third the bark, and save from thirty to forty per cent.' He sent to the editor of the Savannah Republican a piece of calf skin tanned by this process in twenty days."

We are indebted to the publishers, Messrs. West & Johnston, of Richmond, for a copy of the work which they have recently issued from the pen of T. W. McMahon, Esq., entitled "Cause and Contrast—an Essay on the American Crisis."

We consider this to be one of the most valuable contributions to the literature of the times, and shall not fail in our

next to draw very copiously upon it. The author has studied his subject carefully and intelligently, and has traced out the causes, with master hand, which underlie the present great revolution. His work deserves a place in every family.

The liberal spirit evinced by Messrs. West & Johnston, is deserving of all praise. They have already published many valuable works applicable to the times, and have others of equal merit ready for the press.

Thanks to the Hon. John H. Reagan, Postmaster-General, for a copy of his annual report—an elaborate pamphlet—which will furnish some interesting material for our next.

Thanks, also, for some interesting notes in regard to a natural curiosity to be found in Missouri, connected with some Indian antiquities, which are sent to us by a soldier from the camp at Cross Wil-lows, which will be referred to in the next issue of the Review.

Having completed the duties entrusted to his charge at Richmond, connected with the produce loan, the editor of the Review *has resumed his residence at New Orleans*, where he will establish an office under the appointment of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the *collection of subscriptions to the loan* as they become due, and the delivery of certificates and bonds. Many of these subscriptions are independent of the blockade, though the largest part are subject to its contingencies. The appointment embraces all of the payments which are to be made at New Orleans from any of the States, and includes also all amounts due in any part of Louisiana or Mississippi, other than such as are made payable at Memphis or Mobile. Subordinate agencies will shortly be appointed in appropriate localities. The instructions of the Treasury department are as follows:

“The following instructions are issued

for the guidance and direction of the agents for collecting subscriptions to the produce loan:

1. The general agents will immediately on receipt of the lists of subscriptions from the Register of the Treasury, appoint a subordinate agent at each place in the State in which he is appointed, where subscriptions are to be paid (other than the place of his own residence), and shall report the same for the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall furnish such agent with lists of the subscriptions payable at such place.

2. At the time appointed for the sale of any produce, or whenever such sale shall take place, the agent shall apply for the proceeds due under the subscription, and may receive the same in coin, treasury notes, or approved foreign bills of exchange drawn against the sale, and taken at the current market rate; and for the said proceeds, shall deliver to the subscriber a receipt exchangeable for bonds or stock, to be issued under the Act of August, 1861, for such period beyond five years as the subscriber may select; and if the particular period shall have been exhausted, the nearest remaining will be furnished instead.

3. Each sub-agent will report and pay weekly to the general agent of his division, or to such assistant treasurer or depository as he may direct, all moneys collected.

4. The general agents will report weekly to the Secretary of the Treasury; and at same intervals, deposit all moneys received with the nearest assistant treasurer or depository.

5. The general agents will receive from the treasurer the bonds or certificates of stock called for by the receipts, and will, with the aid of their sub-agents, be the medium to exchange the same with the holders of the receipts.

6. All agents shall have authority to receive additional subscriptions, and are earnestly requested to take all measures in their power to procure the same; and they will be furnished with blank subscription lists for that purpose.

7. Whenever a proposal is made to subscribe army supplies in kind, the agent to whom it is made shall report the same to the nearest quartermaster or commissary, and upon a certificate of the value as adjusted by such officer, and that the article has been received, the said agent shall issue a receipt for the amount so certified, and report the same to his principal or to this department.”

The Review will, we hope, be issued regularly during the war, either monthly or, if necessary, bi-monthly. The editor will remit no exertion to secure the former, and his residence at New Orleans will be very favorable. The duties of public office will not be such as to interfere with those of the Review. He will be found at his old quarters on Camp street. Subscribers will please remit to him at that point, or instruct their merchants to make payment. The times are certainly "out of joint," but he will still hope for a large and liberal offering from the planting community. The small amount of the subscription will be missed by few. Those who have failed to receive numbers will please give notice of the fact. The office at Charleston, under B. F. De Bow, will be continued as heretofore.

It pleases us to receive the occasional contributions of our young Southern muse, and especially where the strains are those of "fair woman." We received the following by mail:

RION HALL, VA.

I send you the enclosed little poem—a tribute of affection to my native State. However imperfect, it comes from the heart at least, and if you deem it worthy of a place in the Review, I would gladly raise my feeble voice along with the many which have passed such beautiful and patriotic encomiums upon our "Sunny South."

Virginia, Virginia, with skies ever blue.

Virginia, Virginia, with skies ever blue,
And mountains that rival the Heaven's own hue;
And streamlets of crystal that laughingly flow
Through the forest's dark shade, and rich valleys below.

I love thy high mountains, and fresh flowing streams.

None fairer e'er waken'd a poet's wild dreams.
Thy flowering meadows in dew sparkling sheen,
With hamlets half hid in their bosoms of green;

The village, with spires pointing up to the sky,
And old grave-yards where our forefathers lie.
O! mother of heroes and sages sublime,
Thy name is renowned on the roll-book of Time!

And here in this loveliest spot 'neath the sun,
Where nature in lavish profusion hath strewn
The treasures of air, and the treasures of earth,
Here beauty and wit and refinement have birth.

Still here are the homes of the free and the brave,
The sons of those sires who cross'd the wide wave,
By priestcraft o'erridden, by monarchs oppress'd,
When liberty rose—a lone star—in the West.

Oh! never shall despots pollute thy green shore!
Tho' darkly the red wing of battle sweep o'er;
Thy motto of old, is thy motto to day—
Sic semper tyrannis, for aye and for aye!

Dear old dominion of the fearless and fair,
Where bright is the sunshine, and balmy the air,
Thy chivalrous children by land and by sea,
Turn ever with loyal devotion to thee.

Then tell me no more of Cashmerian vales,
Of the incense of Araby's spice laden gales,
Of Iberian streams where Sierras look down,
Of the dark, flowing Danube, or "arrowy Rhone;"

But give me the beautiful valley that lies
All mantled in green, 'neath Virginia's soft skies,
Where thro' the soft mountains the wild rivers roar,
Potomac majestic, and clear Shenandoah.

O! match me my own sparkling stream of the stars*
Ye waters whose beauty the artist allures,—
Old Virginia's blue mounts and broad rivers for me,
Where nature is lovely, and man is still free.

EGLANTINE.

Jefferson City, Va.

* Shenandoah, in the Indian tongue, signifies "Daughter of the stars."

There is little to be added to what was said in our last in regard to the *Progress of the War*.

The enemy having made a degrading surrender to the British lion, and prostrated themselves in the dust with his first roar over the Mason and Slidell arrest, are now actively at work in "quelling the rebellion," in which they still promise themselves easy times. It is thought that, wind and weather permitting, they will shortly make an assault from the Potomac, and simultaneously move with the Burnside expedition, which is now on the North Carolina coast, against Raleigh and Richmond. Their plans are certainly vast, and every resource of the Confederacy must now be brought into play. With a full confidence in the justice of our cause, and

the valor of our men, we stand ready to welcome the vandals at every point, and maintain and perpetuate our liberties.

Mrs. C. M. Jordan, of Lynchburg, Va., encloses us a copy of two patriotic odes, composed by her in honor of the victory at Manassas. The following extract will show the spirit and fire which glow in them, and which distinguish our Southern women everywhere:

"The day is our's, alas! we pause, in tears we pause to tell,
A wail was heard in heaven when the gallant Bartow fell,—
The wail of fearless men-in-arms, by dauntless courage led,
The wail of struggling Freedom for a noble champion dead.

"And lo! among the fallen, in our honored ranks we see
The noble forms of Bradford, Irvine, Johnson, Fisher, Bee;
Green wave the turf above them, honored be the mantling sod
Which now hides the mortal caskets of the spirits gone to God.

"A blessing to their memory, a tear upon their graves,
Where shines the Southern Cross, and where the sweet Magnolia waves;
We will tell it to our children, how they fought and how they died—
With their swords unsheathed for victory, gleaming high above each side."

The Treasury Department has issued a circular to the Commissioners appointed to take subscriptions to the Confederate loan, which opens a new and desirable scheme of finance. Persons having money at their disposal, will be enabled to make the most advantageous investments, as will be perceived by a careful perusal of the circular:

"Treasury notes have now become a received and general circulation. Any holder of \$500 of such notes may receive an interest of six per cent. upon them, by depositing them with any Assistant Treasurer or Depositary of the Confederate Government. These officers are to be found at Richmond, Wilmington, Charleston, Savannah, Mobile, New Orleans, Galveston, Memphis and Nashville. Upon making the deposit, a certificate for the

same will be issued, bearing interest at the rate of six per cent. per annum, and re-exchangeable, at the will of the holder, for Treasury notes. It will be perceived that this arrangement is equivalent to a deposit on call, upon which six per cent. interest may be had.

I would, also, request you to bring to the notice of capitalists that Treasury notes may, at any time, be exchanged for bonds or registered stock of the Confederate States, bearing an interest of eight per cent. per annum, payable semi-annually—the said bonds or stock to be payable at any period between three years and eighteen years, at the pleasure of the holder of the notes. The exchange can be made by depositing the notes with any of the above-named officers of the Government, or with any of the Commissioners who have heretofore acted in receiving money for the Confederate loan.

On our route from Richmond to New Orleans we paused to shake hands with old associates at *Charleston*, and to survey the scene of the late conflagration. The spectacle is heart-rending, indeed, but we are glad to say that the extent of the mischief falls very far short of what is believed in other quarters. But little individual distress exists, and the hearts of the people are still erect and defiant. They can and will endure any and all things except the Yankees, and these they are prepared for at every point. The word is "let them come, and speedily." We examined the fortifications, and talked with prominent citizens. But one sentiment exists, and that is "*war to the death*." No one doubts of the success of our arms in any encounter that may happen, and South Carolina will make her brilliant mark upon the pages of the war. As worthy of record, we preserve the message of President Davis in regard to the fire, though he erroneously considers the larger portion of the city in ashes. But a *sixth* of the city is involved.

"To the Congress of the Confederate States:

GENTLEMEN—The calamity which has laid in ashes the larger portion of the City of Charleston, calls for our sympa-

thies, and seems to justify the offer of aid in the manner hereinafter suggested. The State of South Carolina will, no doubt, assist Charleston in her hour of need; but as her resources are now taxed to the utmost in resisting the invasion of her soil, the prompt intervention of this Government may not be deemed unsuitable to the occasion. The State of South Carolina, in common with other States, have made a liberal advancement on account of the war, and this Government is unquestionably largely her debtor, and, with the existing pressure upon her resources, it is probable her desire to aid the suffering City of Charleston may be restrained by other demands upon her available means. Under such circumstances, we may exhibit our sympathy with her people by an offer to place at the control of the legislature of the State, now in session, a portion of the sum we owe her. The magnitude of her calamities affords good reason for making an exception in her favor, and the promptness of your action will manifest in the most appropriate manner the sincerity of our regard for the people of that gallant State, and our entire sympathy in all that concerns them. I recommend, therefore, that Congress make an appropriation of such an amount as may be deemed sufficient for the purpose proposed, to be placed at the control of the authorities of the State of South Carolina.

(Signed) JEFFERSON DAVIS."

We extract the following from a letter recently received by us from an intelligent friend in Alabama, touching the question of a *Confederate navy*:

"I never favored an embargo, except to give notice to foreign nations of the patriotism of our people by giving it expression in the form of law. For that purpose, it is now too late. In regard to Mr. Jefferson's embargo, Mr. Calhoun unquestionably took the correct view. The policy then was to force the Yankees to be patriotic. It seems that, really, we have no declared policy in regard to our staples. Why not, then, let English capitalists put their sterling bills of exchange upon the cotton of the produce loan, and with the proceeds get a navy by purchasing steel clad steamships. It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of a navy to us. The brave Ingraham, Tatnal, Semmes, and others, would then soon give us an unfettered commerce, and what is vitally important, we could then have a sound currency. Anything to answer as a currency, you

know, must be convertible into coin. These, then, are the objects obtained, to wit: first, a navy; second, our staples would find an outlet to market, and thus we would obtain specie, and so our Confederate notes and bonds could be convertible into coin; and thus we should have a sound currency and an unfettered commerce; and if to these we have the wisdom to adopt pure free trade principles, we might exclaim, in the language of old Simeon: "now Lord lettest thou thy servant depart in peace." If it cost us the value of a cotton crop, we must have a navy. With that, we could fight the Yankees conveniently for fifty years without impeding the great cause of commerce and civilization, and to the Confederate States alone would belong the glory and renown.

A friend writes us:

"It is well for railroad companies to look to the future supply of car-springs. The present equipment, in rolling stock, must, in a few years, greatly deteriorate. We have an abundance of wood and iron in the Confederacy; but to make cars, we must have steel or rubber for springs; such is the dictum of railroad men. One of two things must soon take place. Either we must learn to make and use cars without springs—which can be done by running trains at slow speed—or some substitute must be found for springs. Steel is not made in the South, but at one place—at the Tredegar works—and that production is now suspended for want of crucibles. India rubber is a foreign production, entirely. Car-springs have heretofore been made out of these two articles. The Tredegar works must get crucibles, if possible, and make steel; or something else must be discovered.

As this is a subject not only vital to railroads, but, also, to the Government and the people, why do not the railroad companies offer a large reward to the inventive geniuses of the country to supply the want? Would it not be cheap at a cost of five or ten thousand dollars?

The following Act in relation to *re-enlistments and bounties to soldiers*, adopted recently in Congress, is of such general interest that we lay it before our readers:

AN ACT providing for the granting of bounty and furloughs to privates and noncommissioned officers in the Provisional Army.

SEC. 1. The Congress of the Confederate States of America do enact, That a bounty of fifty dollars be, and the same is hereby

granted to all privates, musicians and noncommissioned officers in the Provisional Army who shall serve continuously for three years, or for the war, to be paid at the following times, to wit: To all now in the service for twelve months, to be paid at the time of volunteering or enlisting for the next two ensuing years subsequent to the expiration of their present term of service. To all now in the service for three years, or for the war, to be paid at the expiration of their first year's service. To all who may hereafter volunteer or enlist for three years, or for the war, to be paid at the time of entry into service.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That furloughs, not exceeding sixty days, with transportation home and back, shall be granted to all twelve-months' men now in service, who shall, prior to the expiration of their present term of service, volunteer or enlist for the next two ensuing years subsequent to the expiration of their present term of service, or for three years, or the war; said furloughs to be issued at such times and in such numbers as the Secretary of War may deem most compatible with the public interest, the length of each furlough being regulated with reference to the distance of each volunteer from his home: *Provided*, That, in lieu of a furlough, the commutation value, in money, of the transportation herein above granted shall be paid to each private, musician or noncommissioned officer, who may elect to receive it, at such time as the furlough itself would otherwise be granted.

SEC. 3. This Act shall apply to all troops who have volunteered or enlisted for a term of twelve months or more in the service of any State, who are now in the service of the said State, and who may hereafter volunteer, or enlist, in the service of the Confederate States, under the provisions of the present Act.

SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That all troops re-volunteering, or re-enlisting, shall, at the expiration of their present term of service, have the power to re-organize themselves into companies, and elect their company officers; and said companies shall have the power to organize themselves into battalions or regiments, and elect their field officers; and after the first election, all vacancies shall be filled by promotion from the company,

battalion or regiment in which such vacancies may occur: *Provided*, That whenever a vacancy shall occur, whether by promotion or otherwise, in the lowest grade of commissioned officers of a company, said vacancy shall always be filled by election. *And, provided further*, That in the case of troops which have been regularly enlisted into the service of any particular State, prior to the formation of the Confederacy, and which have, by such State, been turned over to the Confederate Government, the officers shall not be elected, but appointed and promoted in the same manner, and by the same authority, as they have heretofore been appointed and promoted.

Approved December 11, 1861.

We call attention to the following card issued by our friends, the Misses Clopton, of Richmond, Va. These ladies are the daughters of the late Judge Clopton, and are refugees from Hampton. They are highly accomplished and talented, and have had much experience in teaching. They have taken a handsome house in Richmond, and have already a flourishing school. We recommend them to the entire Southern public with the utmost confidence, having tested their merits in our own family:

MISSES CLOPTON'S BOARDING AND DAY SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES, ON FRANKLIN STREET, BETWEEN THIRD & FOURTH, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

Terms.—Payable in advance at the commencement of each half session.—Primary English, \$30; Higher English, \$40; Modern Languages, each —; Latin, —; Music, professor's prices, or \$60; use of Piano for practising, \$10; Board—Washing extra—\$200. Calisthenics, a daily exercise. Elocution, Writing and Belles Lettres particularly attended to. A course of Drawing from models is included in English. The School will open on the 1st of October, 1861, and close the last of June, 1862.

Reference.—Mr. J. D. B. DeBow.

Pupils can remain during the vacation at the same rate of board.

DE BOW'S REVIEW.

ESTABLISHED JANUARY, 1846.

MARCH AND APRIL, 1862.

VOL. XXXII, O. S.] ENLARGED SERIES. [VOL. VII, Nos. 3 & 4, N. S.

ART. I.—SOMERSET'S CASE.

More than four years before the declaration of American independence the seeds of the ultimate disruption of the United States were liberally sown. While British statesmen were goading the colonists into rebellion, British troops were announcing principles of public law destined to prove the prolific source of internal conflict and intestine discord in the then embryo republic. The abundant harvest of blood and death, which summons while we write nearly one million of armed men into the field of destiny, is the legitimate fruit of the baneful seed of judicial abolitionism. In June, 1772, Lord Mansfield, in announcing the judgment of the Court of King's Bench, upon the petition of a negro slave for the benefit of the writ of habeas corpus, was unwittingly inaugurating a civil revolution, whose smothered fires, gathering strength in nearly a century of slumber, were to burst forth with intensest rage and desolating fury in our own midst and our own day.

The case of James Somerset is an apt illustration of the inconsistency and effrontery which has characterized the career of abolitionism from that day to this. At the very time when the royal veto was obstructing the repeatedly expressed will of the people of Virginia, and imposing on them against their wishes the institution of African slavery—when British merchants and British seamen, under the sanction and protection of British power, were peopling America with slaves, the Court of King's Bench gravely enunciated from Westminster Hall the invalidity of every title they were forcing the colonists to purchase, in the eye of that common law which formed the basis of the American as well as the British social system.

In 1769, a Mr. Stewart, resident in Virginia, visited England, carrying with him his negro slave, James Somerset, a native of Africa imported and sold in Virginia. He remained there some

two years, during all which time Somerset continued with him, until some time in the fall of 1771, when he ran off from his master. Upon recovering him, Mr. Stewart committed him to the custody of one Captain Knowles, then about to embark for Jamaica, for the purpose of transporting him thither. Thereupon some officious abolitionists applied to Lord Mansfield for a writ of habeas corpus. The writ was awarded, and Lord Mansfield adjourned the hearing until the next term of court, when the case was elaborately argued by some of the ablest members of the London bar. The court endeavored to evade a decision, and in a whining appeal for relief from the responsibility of determining a question upon which hung the tenure of £700,000 sterling of property, the *status* of 14,000 or 15,000 Africans then held as slaves in England, Lord Mansfield suggested a compromise out of court, or an application to Parliament. To await the result of the appeal, the case was permitted to lay over for another term. Mr. Stewart, it seems, declined to relieve the court of its embarrassment in either of the modes suggested, and a decision had to be made. Accordingly, at Trinity Term, on the 22d June, 1772, Lord Mansfield, as the organ of the court, pronounced judgment, discharging Somerset.

The case is reported in *Lofft's Rep.* 1, under the title of *Somerset vs. Stewart*, and though Lofft is a reporter of doubtful reputation, see the *Reporter*, by Wallace, p. 85, *note*, the opinion of the court, as he gives it, is adopted and republished, with the lengthy and ingenuous argument of Mr. Hargrave, one of the negro's counsel, as prepared by himself for publication, in 20 *Howell's State Trials*, 1. Mr. Hargrave's learned argument does not purport to conform strictly to what was said on the trial, and in its tendency is vastly more comprehensive than the judgment of the court. Lord Campbell in his *Lives of the Chief Justices*, 2 vol., 320 (*Am. Ed.*), professes to give the decision of Lord Mansfield, but the report is materially different from that of Lofft, and utterly inconsistent with Lord Mansfield's own statement of its extent, in *Rex vs. Inhabitants of Thames Ditton*, 3 *Doug.*, 300 (26 *E. C. L. R.*, 367). Mr. Colt, the learned author of a valuable treatise, not yet concluded, upon the Law of Slavery, made an abortive effort to elicit some contemporary authority for the report of the biographer: but Lord Campbell's reply, in confessing his inability to refer to any printed authority, fails to relieve him from the very questionable attitude in which he placed himself before the professional public. 1 *Colt on St.*, 169, *note*.

We do not hold Lord Mansfield responsible for all the wild and extravagant dogmas which have been ascribed to him, either as *ipsissima verba* or legitimate deductions therefrom. His opinion, however, was sufficiently comprehensive to deny the authority of the master, under the common law, to hold and

enforce the service of his slave; and abolitionism has been abundantly justified in sheltering itself under the cover of his great name.

The judgment of the court in Somerset's case is altogether unworthy, however, of his deservedly high juridical reputation. Indeed, considering the magnitude of the question at issue, and the recognized ability of the bench, it is shamefully jejune and feeble. In twelve short lines, without attempting to develop the reasons which induced his conclusion, the court dogmatically announces the inconsistency of slavery with English law, and virtually emancipates fourteen thousand or fifteen thousand slaves. After reciting the facts, the return of the writ, etc., a preface of an octavo page and a half, the court proceeds: "So high an act of dominion must be recognized by the law of the country where it is used. The state of slavery is of such a nature that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons, moral or political, but only positive law, which preserves its force long after the reasons, occasion and time itself, from whence it was created, is erased from memory. It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but positive law. 'Whatever inconveniences, therefore, may follow from a decision, I cannot say this case is allowed or approved by the law of England, and, therefore, the black must be discharged.'"

We propose to do what Lord Mansfield did not: to examine this dogma by the light of reason and authority, of principle and history.

Lexicographers generally agree in deducing the words slave and slavery from the national appellation of the Slavonian tribe, "who at an early age made their appearance in the northeastern borders of Europe, pouring down on those countries from the middle regions of Asia. These hordes overspread the countries from the Black sea to the icy ocean, and in their turn were forced westward by similar hordes of Wends, Veneti, Antes, Goths and Huns. Thus attacked and pushed in the rear, they poured them upon the inhabitants of the more western regions, who, more warlike and with superior arms, put them to death by thousands. Thus fleeing from death, they meet it in front, until the nations then occupying the north and east of Europe, satiated and sickened by their slaughter, seized upon their persons as slaves and converted them into beasts of burden. Their numbers exceeding all possible use, the captors exported them as an article of traffic, and the Venetians being a commercial people, enriched themselves by the traffic for a number of years. All continental Europe was thus filled up by the race from the Adriatic to the Northern ocean. Thus, their national appellation became throughout Europe the significant term for a man in bondage; and although in their own language their name signified *fame and distinction*, yet in all the world beside it has superseded the Hebrew, the Greek and the Roman

terms to signify the condition of servitude. Thus, the Dutch and Belgians say *slaaf*; Germans, *sclave*; Danes, *slave* and *sclave*; Swedes, *slaf*; French, *esclave*. The Celtic French, etc., *sclaaf*; Italians, *schiaivo*; Spanish, *esclavo*; Portuguese, *escravo*; Gaelic, *sladhadh*; and the English, *slave*." *Fletcher's Studies on Slavery*, 381. Milman, in a note to Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, tells us that, "The conversion of their national into an appellative name, appears to have arisen in the eighth century in the oriental France, where the bishops and princes were rich in Slavonian captives." 4 *Gibbon*, ch. lv.

Slaves were denominated by the ancient Romans *servi*, from the practice of their generals to sell their captives, and thus preserve (*seware*) and not slay them. They were also called *mancipia*, in that they were taken from the enemy by hand (*manu capti*). *Justinian's Ins.*, 1, 3, 3.

Few things are more difficult than an accurate definition of words, and this difficulty is readily recognized in the varied attempts to define slavery. Mr. Hargrave seems to have fully appreciated the difficulty; and, rejecting as insufficient and inaccurate the several definitions he quotes, endeavors to describe it by an enumeration of several of its usual incidents. The vice of the ordinary definitions of slavery consists in their restriction to the rights of the master to control and command, and the obligation of the slave to serve and obey—properties which are not peculiar to slavery: in the familiar relations of husband and wife and parent and child, properties of the same character exist—and if they are more extensive in slavery, it is merely because the law concedes them and not because they are essential to the institution. If the law limited the extent of the master's authority by the same measure which it metes out to the husband and father, it might produce a more benignant form of slavery, but it would be still slavery. The peculiar characteristic of slavery, which distinguishes it from all other social relations, seems to be generally ignored in all the efforts at definition. That is the idea of property attached to a person. Where the law recognizes in one man a right of property in another, subject to transfer as property at the pleasure of the one without reference to the will of the other, the relation between the two is accurately defined, in legal language, as that of master and slave, and the legal relation is not changed by any limitations which the law may impose upon the exercise of the master's authority. If we could imagine a state of society where law exists, and that law to impose no restraint upon the master's authority, but to concede to him "an absolute and unlimited power over the life and fortune of the slave," Sir Wm. Blackstone's idea of "pure and proper slavery" (1 *Black. Com.* 423,) would be realized. In that state of society the law would ignore the existence of the slave altogether as a *person*, and recognize him only as *property*. He

could owe to the community no obligation for the breach of which he could be civilly or criminally responsible. In all civilized countries, however, where slavery has existed, and we believe it has existed, at some period of their history, among every people, the slave has been regarded, to some extent, as a person, and, as such, has been subject to responsibility to the community for criminal acts, and guarantied by the community certain personal rights, even against his own master. In the most rigid form of slavery, the slave has a right to demand of his master necessary food and clothing, and in sickness, or imbecility from age, proper sustenance and support. It matters not, though the slave be denied a hearing in preferring his own complaint for a breach of these rights. The community places them upon a far higher ground when it undertakes to punish their breach as an offence against itself.

We are generally told that slavery is a violation of natural right, has its origin in force, and its only justification, if any, in the general consent of the world at some remote period in the past, when the ancestors of those now held in subjection were reduced into bondage. This prevalent opinion is expressed by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of the *Antelope* (10 *Wheaton*, 120), in the following terms: "That the slave-trade is contrary to the law of nature, will scarcely be denied; that every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor, is generally admitted; and that no other person can rightfully deprive him of those fruits and appropriate them against his will, seems to be the necessary result of this admission. But, from the earliest times war has existed, and war confers rights in which all have acquiesced. Among the most enlightened nations of antiquity, one of these was that the victor might enslave the vanquished. This, which was the usage of all, could not be pronounced repugnant to the law of nations, which is certainly to be tried by the test of general usage. That which has received the assent of all, must be the law of all. Slavery, then, has its origin in force; but as the world has agreed that it is the legitimate result of force, the state of things which is thus produced by general consent cannot be unlawful." We cannot yield assent to these principles, despite the high authority which endorses them. There is a necessary dependence upon and connection with others of his kind so essential to the existence of each individual man, that we may claim for him few if any rights absolutely. He is born the member of a household and the subject of a state. Upon the care and attention of others, he is dependent for the preservation of life and the developing and maturing of the faculties necessary to its enjoyment. He has no rights which begin and end in himself. He may not be a mere cumberer of the ground. As a member of society, there are obligations resting upon him from which he may not escape; and his rights are proportioned to those obligations.

He has not even an absolute right to his own life. The community of which he is a member may rightfully exact of him the sacrifice of that, even in the absence of crime. Surely, if there be a natural right it is the right to life. Yet, was it ever contended that natural right was violated when an imperilled state commanded from their homes the reluctant and the timorous to repel invasion from her soil? The responsibilities and the duties that devolve upon man vary necessarily with the circumstances in which he is placed. There are burthens which every individual of the species has to bear, and his natural rights, their character and extent, depend thereon. The God who made him "visits the iniquities of fathers upon children," and showeth mercy not only to the righteous, but to their seed after them. Are not children born into the world every day and every hour upon whom, through life, is to be entailed disease and suffering, the immediate and palpable consequence of the crime of their parents? Aye, more: are not the consequences of national guilt visited continually, even to the third and fourth generation, upon the innocent citizen? Human wisdom may cavil at the justice of God, but "His ways are not as our ways, nor His thoughts as our thoughts." Natural right is but an infidel synonyme for God-given right, and when in his providence he visits bondage or affliction upon any race, who shall say that wrong is done to every individual who is born unto the heritage?

In the *Institutes of Justinian*, lib. 1, tit. 3, Sec. 4, slaves are said to become such in three ways, viz: by birth when the mother is a slave, by captivity in war, and by the voluntary sale of himself as a slave by a freeman above the age of twenty, for the sake of sharing the price. Sir Wm. Blackstone, 1 *Com.*, 423, quoted by Mr. Hargrave in a note to his argument, contends that all three, as origins of the right of slavery, are built upon false foundations.

In respect to captives in war, "the conqueror, say the civil-ians, had a right to the life of the captive, and having spared that, has a right to deal with him as he pleases. But it is an untrue position, when taken generally that by the law of nature or of nations, a man may kill his enemy; he has only a right to kill him in particular cases; in cases of absolute necessity for self-defence; and it is plain this absolute necessity did not exist, since the victor did not actually kill him but made him prisoner. War is itself justifiable only on principles of self-preservation; and, therefore, it gives no other right over prisoners but merely to disable them from doing harm to us, by confining their persons; much less can it give a right to kill, torture, abuse, plunder, or even to enslave an enemy when the war is over. Since, therefore, the right of making slaves by captivity depends upon a supposed right of slaughter, that foundation failing the consequence drawn from it must fail also."

The reasoning here is insufficient. In the absence of any actual or asserted right by the law of nature or nations to kill the captives, may not the reduction of the whole race into slavery, or their absolute extermination be, under some circumstances, necessary to the security and peace of the enemy; and if so, is not the former alternative the wiser and the more humane? But, may not the right to kill or to enslave have been mutually conceded to two contending countries? We waive the moral question, and speak of the matter of fact. May not under such a compact slavery have been established, and perpetuated by descent after the light of civilization and Christianity has revealed to the contracting parties the crime, if there was any, of the original compact? But, by virtue of that compact, captives had been preserved, and the right of property fastened on them and their children. It might be conceded that the original enslaving was wrong; and it would still leave a burthen upon Sir Wm. Blackstone, to maintain the unlawfulness of the existing institution.

"It is said that slavery may begin *jure civili* when one man sells himself to another. This, if only meant of contracts to serve or work for another, is very just; but, when applied to strict slavery in the sense of the laws of old Rome or modern Barbary, is also impossible. Every sale implies a price, a *quid pro quo*—an equivalent given to the seller in lieu of what he transfers to the buyer; but what equivalent can be given for life and liberty, both of which (in absolute slavery) are held to be at the master's disposal? His property also, the very price he seems to receive, devolves *ipso facto* to his master the instant he becomes his slave. In this case, therefore, the buyer gives nothing and the seller receives nothing; of what validity, then, can a sale be which destroys the very principles upon which all sales are founded?" To which Mr. Locke adds another kind of argument, the substance of which is, that a right of preserving life is unalienable; that freedom from arbitrary power is essential to the exercise of that right; and, therefore, no man can by compact enslave himself. *Locke on Gov., lib. 2, ch. 4.* A still further objection is urged to slavery by compact: that, conceding a man's right to enslave himself, he has no right to enslave his children. To this we reply, that it presents no moral difficulty. The parent is the natural guardian of the child, and from the position he occupies must, in a great measure, necessarily influence its destiny in life. The laws of Providence expose it to the consequences of his acts, and the laws of all human societies authorize him to exercise an almost absolute control at that very period in which the career for good or ill is well-nigh invariably shaped.

So far as the objections of Blackstone are cited, there is one conclusive reply. The law and common sense recognize executory contracts, and such is the contract in question. The con-

sideration upon the one side, is perpetual service; upon the other, perpetual support and sustenance for himself and his little ones. Would a dispassionate observer of the condition of the operatives in many European manufacturing establishments reckon such a contract a uniformly unwise one upon the part of the slave? In reference to the power of the master over life, that we have shown is not a necessary element of the contract. The right to preserve life may be inalienable, and any assault upon that might be rightfully resisted in spite of any engagement, though the possibility of such assault might not invalidate the contract. But, might not an operative, dependent for life upon the scanty earnings of his own hands, and unable to obtain employment, with the immediate prospect of death by starvation staring him in the face, wisely judge it well to purchase exemption from immediate dissolution by submitting himself to the power of a master, whose known benevolence afforded a better guarantee against violence and cruelty than any legal restraint could ensure?

"Lastly, we are told that, besides these two ways by which slaves '*fiunt*' or are acquired, they may also be hereditary '*seur nascuatur*;' the children of acquired slaves are *jure naturæ*, by a negative kind of birthright, slaves also. But this being built on two former rights, must fall together with them. If neither captivity nor the sale of one's self can by the law of nature and reason reduce the parent to slavery, much less can they reduce the offspring." The author has not fairly represented the argument upon which hereditary slavery is justified. The right to enslave the child need not be attributed to the power over the parent, acquired by the adverse fortune of war, or his voluntary compact. If so, it might extend to children who had attained adult age prior to the loss of liberty by the parent. There is a much more imposing consideration which controls the destiny of the child than any act of his parent. If life be esteemed of more value than liberty—and the mass of mankind certainly so regard it—the hereditary bondman may well be content to compensate, with his service, the master to whose tender care and bounty he is indebted for the preservation of life itself. Infancy and childhood exact attention and sustenance from others, and that attention and sustenance constitute a valuable consideration, upon which the obligation to repay may well be based. It will not do to say that slavery is a compensation ill-proportioned to the original expenditure, for the opponents of slavery are accustomed to contend that the institution is unprofitable to the slave-holder. Be that as it may, the benefit to the slave is more than proportioned to the price at which he purchases it. "Give me liberty or give me death," is the honest sentiment of comparatively few. The humblest slave who toils beneath the burning sun of the tropics, and the convict condemned to perpetual isolation from his

species, and the degrading bondage of a life-long imprisonment, eling to life as instinctively and tenaciously as the most favored child of fortune.

The original wrong to the parent in enslaving her, if conceded, may not necessarily alter the obligations of the child to the protector of its infancy and the preserver of its life: for the parent, though wrongfully enslaved in the first instance, may devolve upon an innocent master, at a time or under circumstances when the withdrawal of the protection of slavery at any subsequent period would be unavoidably disastrous. It is the misfortune of the child, then, to be born of parents who cannot fulfil the obligations they have incurred. The gift of life by its creator is accompanied by conditions which render its continuance and the enjoyment of liberty altogether incompatible.

It cannot be maintained, that out of the consequences of a wrongful act rightful obligations may never arise. The immorality of privateering may be conceded, and yet the absolute right of property in the innocent and ignorant purchaser for value of the prize may not be called in question. My neighbor may have his property stolen from him, he may incur a rightful obligation to recompense me for replacing it. If it be a living animal and be left upon my premises, and I am necessarily subjected to expense in maintaining it before I discover the owner, he may not reclaim it until he has satisfied me all charges.

Writers who sustain the view we have been considering, class as the highest natural right the right to life. Is there not an inconsistency in assuming that a relation tending to secure and preserve that as inconsistent with another natural right. The carefully compiled statistics of slave-holding countries, establish the fact that the ratio of increase among slaves exceeds that among free laborers. The number of births is greater; the number of deaths in infancy and childhood is smaller. There must, surely, be some error in the reasoning which imputes to an institution—the effect of which is to preserve life and increase his species—a violation of the God-given rights of man.

Dr. Barnes, of Philadelphia, deduces an argument against the maintenance of slavery by the South, from the fact of the rapid increase of the slave population. He says: "The whites were to the slaves—

	In 1790.	In 1840.
North Carolina.....	2.80 to 1.....	1.97 to 1
South Carolina.....	1.81 to 1.....	79 to 1
Georgia.....	1.76 to 1.....	1.44 to 1
Tennessee.....	13.35 to 1.....	3.49 to 1
Kentucky.....	5.16 to 1.....	3.23 to 1

"From this it is apparent that, in spite of all the oppressions and cruelties of slavery, of all the sales that are effected, of all

the removals to Liberia, and of all the removals by the escape of the slaves, there is a regular gain of the slave population over the free in the slave-holding States. No oppression prevents it here more than it did in Egypt, and there can be no doubt whatever that, unless slavery shall be arrested in some way, the increase is so certain that the period is not far distant when, in all the slave states, the free whites will be far in the minority. At the first census taken in 1790, in every slave state there was a very large majority of whites. At the last census, in 1840, the slaves outnumbered the whites in South Carolina, Mississippi and Louisiana. The tendency of this, from causes which it would be easy to state, can be arrested by nothing but emancipation."—*Barnes on Slavery, Philadelphia, 1846, p. 95.*

The foreign slave trade was suppressed in 1810, and since that date the increase of slaves in the United States has been purely a natural one. Texas was annexed in 1844, and in 1850 her slave population numbered 58,161. Perhaps some little deduction should be made on this account, but it is well known that a vast majority of the slaves held in the Republic of Texas were emigrants from the southern United States. We will allow, however, more than one-half, say 30,000, to cover her importations from other sources. In 1810, the slave population of the United States was 1,191,364; in 1850, 3,204,313. Increase in forty years, 2,012,949; or, allowing for Texas, 1,982,949—a ratio of more than 166 per cent. In the same time, the free negro population has increased from 186,446 to 434,495—248,049—a ratio of more than 133 per cent. Notwithstanding the accretion of the latter class, at the expense of the former, the increase is much less. In the same time, the white population has increased from 5,862,004 to 19,553,068—an accession of 13,691,064 (a large portion of which was due to foreign emigration)—a ratio of 233 per cent. From 1840 to 1850, the slave population increased from 2,487,455 to 3,204,313, an accession of 716,858—and deducting 30,000 for Texas, we have, as the natural increase of ten years, 686,858, or 27.61 per cent. During the same decade, the free negroes increased less than half as rapidly, i. e., 12.47 per cent.—from 386,303 to 434,495. The white population increased in the same decade from 14,195,695 to 19,553,068—5,357,373. The number of passengers arriving during the same decade from abroad were 1,397,350. The number who returned could scarcely exceed, we suppose, the additions derived from Texas, California, etc., and of emigrants failing to register themselves. Deducting this number from the decennial increase, the natural increase of white Americans appears to be 3,960,023—a ratio of 27.89 per cent.—a fraction greater than the slave increase.

Massachusetts is generally commended as a model for the imitation of the Southern states, and the pseudo philanthropy of abolition pervades, perhaps, more extensively her people than

those of any of her sister states. We have taken some trouble to make an examination and calculation from the census of 1850, not having access to that of 1860, comparing the relative number of births and deaths, and consequent rate of natural increase among her entire white population, with that of the slaves of the South. We take the whole slave population of the United States into consideration in one view, and that of the States of Virginia and Mississippi severally, as representatives of the border and Gulf states:

	FREE POPULATION.		SLAVE POPULATION.		
	U. S.	Mass.	Unit. St.	Virga.	Miss.
Population.....	19,987,573	994,504....	3,204,287	472,528	309,878
Births.....		23,192....	80,609	11,155	7,399
Deaths.....	272,929	19,404....	52,504	8,451	5,347
Ann. Increase.....		3,788....	28,105	2,704	2,052
Dec. Increase.....		37,880....	281,050	27,040	20,520
Rat. of Dec. Increase..		3.81 p.c....	8.77 p.c.	5.72 p.c.	6.62 p.c.
Rat. of Deaths to Births		83.66 p.c....	65.13 p.c.	74.86 p.c.	72.26 p.c.
Rat. of Deaths to Pop'n	136 p.c.	1.95 p.c....	1.63 p.c.	1.78 p.c.	1.72 p.c.
Rat. of Births to Pop'n		2.33 p.c....	2.51 p.c.	2.36 p.c.	2.38 p.c.

It thus appears that, while the ratio of births is nearly equal, an immense disproportion exists in regard to deaths—making the ratio of natural increase of the entire white population of Massachusetts less than half that existing among the slaves of the South. If we could compare the statistics of her laboring class, we would find the disproportion of course much greater; and still more perceptible would be a contrast of the slave and free negro statistics. These figures indicate very clearly that the great natural right of life is certainly not imperilled seriously by a loss of liberty on the part of the negro.

Captivity in war has been most generally assigned as the origin of the institution, but its existence ante-dating legislation, the problem has been one prolific rather of curious speculation than susceptible of any satisfactory solution. Lord Coke says: "*Fiunt etiam servi liberi homines captivitate de jure gentium*, and not by the law of nature, as from the time of Noah's flood forward, in which time all things were common to all, and free to all men alike, and lived under the law natural; and, by multiplication of people, and making proper and private those things which were common, arose battles. And then it was ordained by constitution of nations (i. e., by the tacit consent of civilized nations), that none should kill another, but that he that was taken in battle should remain bond to his taker for ever, and to do with him and all that should come of him his will and pleasure, as with his beast, or any other chattel, to give or to sell or to kill; and, after it was ordained for the cruelty of some lords that none should kill them, and that the life and members of them as well as of freemen were in the hands and protection of kings, and that he that killed his villain should have the same judgment as if he had killed a freeman.—1 *Tho. Co. Litt.*, 403.

Mitford, in his History of Greece, ascribes the origin of slavery to the same cause, and commends it as a beneficent improvement upon former customs. "When warlike people, emerging from the savage state, first set about agriculture, the idea of sparing the lives of prisoners, on condition of their becoming useful to the conquerors by labor, was an obvious improvement upon the practice of former times, when conquered enemies were constantly put to death—not from a spirit of cruelty but from necessity, for the conquerors were unable to maintain them in captivity, and dared not set them free. Slavery thus established, it is easy to conceive how it would increase. In infant societies labor cannot be hired, because all can employ themselves in their own concerns."—1 *Mitf. Greece*, 317, *ch. vi, sec. 4*.

It is quite as natural and probable, however, to suppose that the relation of master and slave was, in the early ages of the world, established by mutual consent. The surrender of nominal liberty by the weak and delicate for the protection of the strong and powerful, in an age when brute force was the universal measure of individual right, would not seem to have been necessarily an unwise exercise of discretion. Sir Archibald Alison thinks it would not. "The universality of slavery in the early ages of mankind," he regards as "a certain indication that it is unavoidable, from the circumstances in which the human race is everywhere placed in the first stages of society. Where capital is unknown, property insecure, and violence universal, there is no security for the lower classes but in the protection of their superiors; and the sole condition on which that can be obtained is that of slavery. Property in the person and labor of the poor is the only inducement which can be held out to the opulent to take them under their protection. Compulsion is the only power which can render labor general in the many ages which must precede the influence of the artificial wants, or a general taste for its fruits. Humanity, justice and policy, so powerful in civilized ages, are then unknown, and the sufferings of the destitute are as much disregarded as those of the lower animals. If they belonged to no lord, they would speedily fall a prey to famine or violence. How miserable soever the condition of slaves may be in those unruly times, they are incomparably better off than they would have been if they had incurred the destitution of freedom."—1 *Alison's Europe—Introduction*, 20.

In more enlightened ages, the condition of the laboring classes has been such as to induce in many the desire to enslave themselves. So many applications were submitted to the legislatures of the Southern states by free negroes for permission to return to slavery, that in some of the states a general act has been passed prescribing the forms necessary to be followed, in order for a free negro to obtain the authority from

court to enslave himself; and instances of voluntary enslavement, under the operation of this law, are of frequent occurrence. Reference to the Virginia statute Sess. Acts, 1855-6, p. 37, ch. 46, will show that every precaution is adopted to secure the deliberate and well-considered election of the negro.

Hume tells us that the practice of selling themselves and children was always the practice among the old Germans, and was continued by the Anglo-Saxons (1 *Hume*, App. 1, p. 163); and Dr. Lingard recites, as one of the sources of Anglo-Saxon slavery, the voluntary enslavement of free born Saxons to escape the horrors of want. 1 *Lingard*, 235, ch. vi.

Gibbon, in his *Decline and Fall*, says that "the subjects of the Merovingian kings might alienate their personal freedom; and this act of legal suicide, which was familiarly practised, is expressed in terms most disgraceful and afflicting to the dignity of human nature. The example of the poor who purchased life by the sacrifice of all that can render life desirable, was gradually imitated by the feeble and the devout, who, in times of public disorder, pusillanimously crowded to shelter themselves under the battlements of a powerful chief, and around the shrine of a popular saint. Their submission was accepted by these temporal or spiritual patrons; and the hasty transaction irrecoverably fixed their own condition and that of their latest posterity." 2 *Gibbon*, 426, chap. xxxviii.

The commonly accepted views upon this subject have been boldly and philosophically assailed by Mr. Fitzhugh, of Virginia, in a recent work entitled "*Sociology for the South*." "It is true," he says, "that ancient peoples made slaves of the vanquished, but it is also true that in all instances we find slavery pre-existing in both the conquering and conquered nation. The word 'servus' is said to derive its origin from the fact that prisoners of war, who were made slaves, were saved or preserved from death thereby; their lives being, according to the law of nations, as then understood, forfeited to the victor. The Chinese every day sell themselves to each other to 'save or preserve' themselves from want, hunger and death. Such instances, no doubt, were of daily occurrence in all ancient societies, and the word 'servus' may have as well originated from this social practice as from the practices of war. We do not think history will sustain the theory that, even in the case of war, it was the mere saving of life that originated the term. Conquerors in feudal times we know, and probably in all times, parcelled out the conquered territory, both the lands and the people, to inferior chieftains, whose interest and duty it became to preserve lands, fruits, crops, houses and inhabitants, from the cruel rapine, waste, pillage and oppression of the common soldiers. It is the interest of victors not to destroy what they have vanquished; and history shows that their usages have conformed to their interests. We deem this definition of the origin

of slavery by war more consistent with history and humanity than the usual one that the mere life of the prisoner was saved—hence he was called ‘servus.’” P. 100.

But whatever may have been the origin of the institution, it is universally conceded to have had existence in very remote antiquity. Lord Coke assumes it to have existed in the person of Canaan, the son of Ham (1 *Tho. Co. Litt.*, 404); but this is not very apparent from the Mosaic record. The curse pronounced upon Canaan, in *Genesis ix*, 25–27, may have been generic, not personal, and need not have been fulfilled for many years subsequent to his death. But there seems no reasonable ground to doubt that the institution existed in the days and in the household of Abraham. See *Genesis xii*, 5, 16.

The existence of slavery among the Hebrews is apparent throughout the whole Biblical record, from the days of Moses to those of our Saviour. See *Matthew xxvi*, 51. “Behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand and drew his sword, and struck the servant (δουλον) of the high priest.” Also *Matt. viii*, 5–14; *Luke vii*, 2–10; *xix*, 12–16, etc., etc. *Fletcher on Slavery*, 117–172. Dr. Cooper, in his notes upon Justinian, says: “Slavery among the Jews took place

“1. When a man sold himself through poverty. *Lev. xxv*, 39.

“2. When a father sold his children. *Ex. xxi*, 7.

“3. When creditors seized and sold their insolvent debtors or their children. 2 *Kings iv*, 1.

“4. A thief was sold when he could not pay his fine. *Ex. xxii*, 3, 4.

“5. Prisoners of war.

“6. A Hebrew slave ransomed from a Gentile might be sold to another Hebrew by his master.

“But the Hebrews were slaves to the Hebrews only for six years, or until the Sabbatical Jubilee. *Ex. xxi*, 2. If the slave married, however, he could not take away with him his wife and children, which belonged to the master. *Ex. xxi*, 4. If, from attachment to the family, the slave refused to be freed at the end of six years, or at the Sabbatical Jubilee, then his master might bore his ears with an awl before the magistrate, and the slave became bound for life. The Hebrew slaves were treated more as hired servants by the Jews. Not so the bondmen procured from among the heathen. But even from the heathen, they were forbidden to acquire a slave by stealth. See *Leviticus xxi* and *xxv*.”—*Cooper's Just.*, 410.

No authority is given for the declaration that prisoners of war were reduced into slavery, and the position has been denied. See, however, for abundant confirmation, *Numbers xxxi*, and *Deut. xx*, 10–16, compared with *xxi*, 10–15, as cited in *Fletcher on Slavery*, 121–125.

The rule of the civil law, that the children inherited the status of the mother and not of the father, would seem to have prevailed among the Hebrews. *Ex. xxi*, 4.

These references establish that the Pentateuch recognized each of the three several sources of slavery recited in Justinian as legitimate means by which the Hebrews might acquire property in slaves.

The idea suggested by the Bishop of St. Asaph's, that there was really no hereditary slavery for life among the Hebrews, because at the year of jubilee all slaves were emancipated, is sufficiently answered by a perusal of the 25th chapter of Leviticus—especially verses 39–46 inclusive. The year of jubilee was the year of emancipation for all Hebrews held as slaves; but the heathen captives held as slaves enjoyed no such privilege. The Hebrews were not, it is true, permitted to enslave their own brethren “as bondmen for ever,” but there was abundant warrant to make hereditary bondmen of the heathen. “They might purchase bondmen of the heathen nations that were round about them, or of those strangers that sojourned among them (excepting of those seven nations that were to be destroyed), and might claim a dominion over them, and entail them upon their families as an inheritance, for the year of jubilee should give no discharge to them.” *Henry's Commentary Leviticus, ch. 25, v. 44–46.*

We find mention of slavery as an extensively existing institution, in the earliest records of Grecian history. Mitford tells us that “tradition in Herodotus' age preserved memory of the time when slavery was unknown in Greece: but before Homer, slaves were very numerous.”—1 *Mitford's History of Greece, ch. 6, sec. 4, p. 317.* Chancellor Kent mentions that “a vast majority of the people of ancient Greece were in a state of absolute and severe slavery;” and upon the authority of Mitford, 1 *vol. p. 316*, adds that at one period in the history of Athens, “the disproportion between freemen and slaves was nearly in the ratio of 30,000 to 400,000.” 2 *Kent's Com., 249.*

“Slavery was not only established by law, but held indispensable in every Grecian republic; but in the several republics the condition of slaves varied. The most remarkable difference, and the most important and yet the least noticed among ancient and modern writers, is “that in some of them the slaves were purchased barbarians—in some they were morally the descendants of subdued Greeks. All the Lacedæmonian slaves appear to have been of the latter kind. There are different accounts of the origin of those miserable men, who were distinguished from all other slaves by name as by condition. The most received is that Helos, whether an Arcadian town or a rebellious dependance of Lacedæmon, is not agreed—being taken by Söus, son of Procles. The inhabitants were, according to the practice of the times, reduced to slavery, and were dispersed in such numbers over Laconia that the name of Helot prevailed in that country as synonymous with slave. It appears, however, probable that the Lacedæmonians, as perhaps

all the Peloponnesian Dorians, had slaves of Grecian race before the reign of Soüs: and we know that after it they reduced numbers of Greeks to that miserable state." 1 *Mitford's Greece*, chap. 5, sec. 2, p. 247.

Slavery among the Romans, to a late period in their history, appeared in the severest form. The repeated successes which attended their warfare upon surrounding barbarians, placed continually in their power innumerable captives, who were, according to the then universally recognized laws of war, reduced into slavery. Being, for the most part, active, robust and warlike men, self-protection required upon the part of the master unsleeping vigilance, accompanied by the legal authority to punish with instant severity. To this cause, doubtless, may be ascribed the harshness of Roman slavery, especially the jurisdiction of life and death, which was unquestionably accorded to the master up to the time of Cláudius, the successor of Caligula (1 *Gibbon*, ch. 11, p. 25), when, probably, all the slaves then in the empire had been tutored into unresisting submission through generations of bondage. Dr. Taylor in *El. Civ. Law*, 429, cited in *Cooper's Just.*, 411, says: "They had no head in the state; no name, title or register; they were not capable of being injured; nor could they take by purchase or descent; they had no heirs, and, therefore, could make no will; exclusive of what was called their peculium, whatever they acquired was their masters'; they could not plead nor be pleaded for, but were excluded from all civil concerns whatever; they could not claim the indulgence of absence *respublicæ causa*; they were not entitled to the rights and considerations of matrimony, and, therefore, had no relief in case of adultery; nor were they proper objects of cognation or affinity, but of quasi-cognation only; they could be sold, transferred or pawned as goods or personal estate, for goods they were, and as such were esteemed; they might be tortured for evidence, punished at discretion of their lord, or even put to death by his authority; together with many other civil incapacities, which I have not room to enumerate."

Of the rigor of the laws and the severity with which they were executed, we are furnished with a striking illustration in one of Cicero's orations against Verres. It seems that there was an edict in Sicily, promulgated by an early prætor, that no slave should ever be seen with a weapon. When Lucius Donutius was prætor an immense boar was slain, and brought to him. Upon enquiry, he learned that it had been slain by a slave, and immediately had him summoned into his presence. Upon the appearance of the slave, in reply to the question of the prætor, he stated that he had killed the animal with a hunting-spear. Whereupon, he was ordered to be crucified, and the order was instantly executed. "This may appear harsh," said the orator; "I say nothing either way. All that I understand

from the story is, that Donutius preferred to appear cruel in punishing to seeming negligent in overlooking offences."

The Roman slaves were not, however, confined to the menial occupations of life. Many of them were educated expensively, and instructed in the arts and sciences. We are told that not a few of the physicians were slaves, and that almost every profession, either liberal or mechanical, numbered slaves among them. 1 *Gibbon, ch. ii., p. 26.*

ART. II.—SOUTHERN SOCIETY AND BRITISH CRITICS.

The following remarks were written many years ago. Time has confirmed their truth, and is about to vindicate the character of the social institutions they defended. When this essay was first penned, socialism was intriguing in France for new revolutions, that that beautiful land might once more be made a slaughter-house of all that was good, noble and intellectual, and that the base, like the Greeks, might apotheosize their unnatural envy into a sort of Nemesis, and who would ostracize virtue, manners and education. In England, the apostolic lights of Exeter Hall were burning with an ominous glare, that indicated a social explosion among the nations. A specious philanthropy that made treason a virtue and patriotism a crime, was fashionable in the most elegant circles of England. Young ladies wept over the imaginary wrongs of the slave; the poets vindicated their woes in verse and music, and politicians found a new and profitable subject for Phillipic eloquence. Members of an English Parliament so forgot their dignity as to cross the Atlantic, and pander to the morbid fancies of unreasonable fanatics. English authors so forgot their glory as to prostitute their genius in instigating those who were once our brothers to the wholesale murder of a chivalrous nation, in that dastardly manner where sleep, and night, and unvigilant innocence, took away the opportunity for resistance. The tide of emancipation ran high. The nations of the earth seemed banded in one fanatic crusade against our liberties, and Southern patience and forbearance, and devotion to the constitution her own fathers made, and her noblest son so pathetically exhorted her to maintain, were stigmatized as but the evidences of cowardice and the effeminacy of corrupt voluptuaries. The tide ran high, and buoyed into a magic popularity the worthless ravings of a Mrs. Stowe—a malignant spy, who hunted amidst the hospitalities of Southern homes for the materials of which she formed her hideous fiction. On that tide of sympathy, Mr. Dickens floated in Northern society.

There has been no greater source of ill-feeling or of deeper

regret than the silly habit of trans-Atlantic authors, easing their spleen by unjust criticisms on our social institutions. Our statesmen have been laughed at because they were not dancing-masters as well as diplomats; our authors have been ridiculed because they were too timid, too awkward, or too conscientious to turn a pretty compliment to please a lady of fashion and set the parlor in a laugh. Our ministers have been termed ascetic, because they wear white cravats and refuse to guzzle wine and corrode their stomachs with dyspeptic viands at midnight suppers. Our institution of slavery, the most humane system by which bigoted ignorance was ever restrained from destroying the liberties it was unfit to enjoy, and the only one by which the heathen could be effectually civilized—the very granite base of modern commercial prosperity—is satirized, not with wit, but the most malignant slander that fanaticism could forge. On the other hand, there has been much recrimination that might have been spared. It is our duty to look on the censure of foreign peoples as arising (as it does) from a narrow-minded envy and jealousy, to say nothing of the political reasons. No weapon is so effective in warding off malicious attacks as a reserved silence and cold dignity. Mr. Dickens is the most important enemy that has abused us. He has hardly honored himself or enhanced his fame by the unjust assault he has made on our people. His "Notes" are certainly most unfavorable records of his temper; and the gross-insult he put upon the people who entertained him with such hospitality, is hardly a fair requital of their kindness.

We cannot reconcile ourselves to the idea that it is becoming a gentleman to criticise either the manners or entertainment of a host, especially where that host has exercised all the ingenuity and courtesy of his nature to please. Mr. Dickens makes comparisons (of course unfavorable to us) between the higher classes of English society and the higher classes of America; and seems much put out because he does not meet a foppish cockney or royal dandy in every stage-driver, in every hotel-keeper, in every author and senator whom he met. But Mr. Dickens should have remembered that he was in a republic, and that dancing and bowing, smiling, and uttering pretty compliments, though graceful accomplishments, are not so professional as in Europe. Perhaps, if you give our countrymen entailed estates, yielding kingly incomes, their descendants, having nothing to do, might, in the course of time, so degenerate as to be born with natural instincts like the setter, with a passion for gaming and drinking, and for kids, jewelry, and gold lace, that would rob the other sex of one of their most becoming and immemorial prerogatives. We might have "emperor fountains," hurling their waters so high as to be dangerous to play them in airy weather, and too troublesome then unless a king was about. We might have our tropics under glass, and ride

in a coach and four, bowling along the smooth avenues of palms and bananas; but, as we have no entailments, the realities of England must at present be the ideals of America. Aggregated capital will some day make all those things for the common pleasure. The youth of an American is generally passed in toilsome independence and manly virtue, in a home blessed with piety and filial affection, which is not lessened by that hateful envy and covetousness engendered among the younger members of a family by the cruel law of primogeniture. The morning of this life is spent in cheerful labor; their manhood in the ease of wealth and dignity of honor that the applause of an approving country confers. His hands may be rough, his motions angular, his conversation common-place—but a sincere nature and generous heart redeems his deficiencies. “But the church!” “Aye, the church!” You have no established ministry in America. Your clergymen are mostly dissenters, and they have stained the white holiness of the church with the spatter from the political slough. A portion of the charge is true, but is only another evidence of our author’s indirection. The fault charged attached solely to his friends and sympathizers at the North. It is certainly true, that we have no fat, lazy bishops, in ridiculous little red caps, like the head-dresses of dancing girls, and with long gowns and robes, more becoming the pomp of a theatrical than a religious character. We have no deacons and rectors and archbishops, enjoying fine salaries that were extorted from a poor congregation. We hate socialism, but we hate no less a parasitical aristocracy that saps a nation of all vitality, and priestly caste who in the morning denounce the theatres and the iniquities of the world, and go to see the “School for Scandal” at night. Although we are not faultless, we thank Heaven we are free from this expensive pomp of a privileged order. The money our people distribute among their ministers for charitable purposes is not a tribute of force, but the measure of the interest they feel in the advancement of Christianity. They are sincere in their religious professions, and manage to worship God and enjoy life without resorting to gaming tables or theatres.

Mr. Dickens is one of the leaders of an aspiring class of fanatics, that infests both England and America. The home portion of these imitate everything of an English appearance, with a notion that by assuming the style and costume of lords they become lords. We do not object to copying the good and beautiful of British life: for in no country has civilization reached such a perfection, if we except the single item—form of government. But Northern men have, unfortunately, mimicked the bad as well as the good. The cut of his lordship’s coat, the curl of the noble locks, the dramatic position milord falls into when surprised, his nonchalance and dandyism, are all elaborately copied. We imagine Mr. Dickens and his compeers

are thoroughly versed in the art of turning up their noses at things better than their's, and persons far their superiors. We have no doubt he is accomplished in the expression of fashionable apathy, in the arrangement of his hair in the classical shape and that best exhibits the intellectuale of the head, and in those minor details of dress that set off the fine points of form and hides awkwardness. At least, report makes him a hero in the practice of the toilet and in the art of manners. These, too, we could not object to, if there was enough abandon to convince one that there was some honest naturalness and no affectation.

This class, of which we speak, are distinguished for a profound ignorance of certain things of which they have a political horror, and their prejudices are impenetrable to conviction. They assume, with all the dignity and authority of an oracle, that Southern men are cruel and slovenly, filthy in domestic life, awkward in society, coarse in conversation, understanding nothing, and wishing to understand nothing but how to lash a weeping slave, or to teach childhood's innocent lips to lisp curses against its nurses in its earliest speech. "Yes!" exclaims Mr. Dickens, "mothers silence the cry of their children by making whips to lash young negroes. Masters, enraged with wine, lop off the ears and noses of negroes, and handcuff them with huge chains." But, most wonderful of all, the slaves run away with these iron attachments, and the master advertises such a slave, "with an iron yoke around his head or an iron fetter on his foot." To read this we imagine we are perusing a description of Roman or Spartan slavery, where humanity to an inferior was considered unmanly. Criminals are treated this way in all countries, as they deserve to be, but to say this is the usual manner of using Southern slaves is untrue. Mr. Dickens is guilty, in the above quotation, either of distorting facts for the purpose of slander, of an out and out falsehood, or has been most mercilessly imposed on by Southern wags. If none of these, his vanity has led him to be witty and into misrepresentation at the expense of principle. We would hardly wish to charge him with the two first; for we believe an honest and humane heart lies beneath the crust of vanity and dandyism that hides the man. If credulity is the reason, we only lament that so much genius should possess so much weakness. If the last accusation holds, it is painful to see how a great intellect and noble heart can be debased by a passion for making sensations. What appearance of truth would Mr. Dickens perceive in the following paraphrase of his language: "English mothers silence the cry of their babies by dosing them with sufficient quantities of alum to contract the vocal organs and preclude a natural utterance." The consequence of this is, a faint, smothered scream is heard beneath their clothes, the voice being turned the wrong way. This, however, is

always remedied by a summary spanking. The older boys are immediately silenced by exclaiming: "Bonaparte is coming!" "English lords, enraged with wine, carve off the ears and noses of their servants, and frequently murder them to have a philosophical contemplation of their dying agonies. It gives them a fine opportunity, to study the 'curious appearances' of the last moments, thereby enriching science with new discoveries. Servants are always compelled to kneel or hide themselves when his lordship passes. A sight that made my blood boil with all manner of indignation, was to see a poor fellow jump out of a window from an entry where there was no room to kneel. Instead of hiding himself, he drowned himself by falling into a horse-pond. The young lords also hurl dinner-plates of gold, studded with jewels, and bottles of wine, at the heads of their servants, when there is a ridiculous scramble for the pearls and rubies among those who do not get broken crowns. Meanwhile, the young lords roll in ecstasies of laughter at the sight, and clap their hands, and cry: 'Bully! Dem foinny, Tom.' Besides this, I have seen the Prince of Wales pour hot gravy in the Lord Chamberlain's bosom and his other servants', and yet the servants never run away; because, without the recommendation of a prince or lord, they would starve. Besides this, puerile displays of passion are considered indispensable to an accomplished gentleman." This picture is partly true in individual cases, and quite as susceptible of proof as the other. But both are sufficiently absurd, and should hardly emanate as anything serious from the most childish and petulant old woman.

In regard to American society, notwithstanding the rough manner in which our youth are generally brought up, the most polished ladies and gentlemen this side of the Atlantic reside in the Southern states; and, on an average, there is more classical education and more courtly cultivation in Southern than in Northern society. Working worse than slaves in factories, from childhood to maturity, is hardly the proper means by which to develop the graces of either body or character. We do not censure the operatives for this, but the hypocritical masters who wish to reform—but to reform at other people's expense, and afar off, and are too mean to be liberal to the wretched class of persons they employ.

The Southern lady or gentleman born in wealth, and always on terms of intimacy with the learned and distinguished, is quite as polished in all that relates to society, and quite as chaste in all that relates to domestic life as any prince or any queen in Europe. Poor or wealthy, if intelligent, they are welcomed in the best society, and enjoy all the opportunities of refinement. Besides, grace, beauty, vivacity and courtesy are indigenous in a southern climate, just as the rich plumage of tropical birds or the splendid flowers and fragrance of tropical

woods. Mr. Dickens must have fallen in with the flash population and city rowdies, and not with the polished, hospitable and intellectual society, for which the South has been justly distinguished since the days of seventy-six. Such slanders should be spared against a people who have furnished pretty much all the orators and statesmen of which the United States could boast, and nearly all the military chiefs that made that nation respected and celebrated. We hardly think that New England or New York would have successfully asserted their independence without the aid of Southern courage and intellect. The last sentence of Mr. Dickens' statement is absurd, and vitiates all that precedes. The fetters and iron yokes are represented as marks through which a slave is recognized when he runs away, and are used for the purpose of preventing any escapes. This hardly requires an answer:

It must be a stolid master who imagines that a slave is ignorant of the existence of files, or how they should be applied. We might quote numerous examples of absurd and malignant statements, but we forbear to expose more than is necessary of the weakness that sullies so much genius. We are indifferent as to what opinion other people may have of the social or political bearing of our institutions, but we *do* demand that facts themselves shall be truthfully told. We are only sorry that Mr. Dickens has allowed himself—innocently or otherwise—to write falsehoods, which outrage decency, and which, we fear, are destined to hand him down to posterity as one who wrote more for money and popularity than for fame or civilization. He has written too much to make his name immortal; he has written too falsely, in many instances, to benefit mankind.

The English novelist, unfortunately, fell in with a clique of toadies and professional philanthropists, who make a profitable trade by simulating the noblest of virtues—the love of man—and who are always prepared to furnish anti-slavery meetings to order with neatness and despatch, groans, tears and billingsgate, white cravats and disconsolate faces, and sobs and bouquets for the orators who are bitterest and most blasphemous. Of course, Mr. Dickens was a lion, and threw pretty compliments to the greedy vanity of his godly friends.

Such men are the bane of all republics. They are the architects of all treason, and the constant fomenters of rebellion. They wind, with prophetic instinct, the tainted air of revolution, long before the birth of the agitation from which it is to spring. They plotted, with cold and devilish deliberation, the destruction of the Grand Republic, and, to the crime of treason added the contemplated villainy of murder and assassination, on a scale that Catherine de Medici might have envied. And out of all this they calmly calculated *their* share of pecuniary aggrandizement. Robespierre can no longer claim to be the prince of monsters. He were an eagle white in purity to

these voracious vultures that longed to grace the bloody surge of a servile revolution. Licentious pirates, they have cloaked their infamous intentions beneath a guise of patriotism, and, with meanness and tyranny masked under the divine smiles of philanthropy, they have allured men to their destruction. We deliberately and earnestly maintain that men like Sumner, Hale and Greeley, are guilty of the most awful of conspiracies against the liberty and happiness of mankind; and if there is a God who listens to the prayers of the oppressed nations, no expiation of the "*one sin*" that damns beyond hope, can conciliate His mercy or soften His vengeance.

They are men of parts, but parts devoted to a false cause. They overturned the best government the world has yet seen, because it did not harmonize with their ascetic philosophy. They wished a reconstruction of the republic on some ideal plan, that presupposed human nature angelic. In them the extreme of virtue is maddened into the extreme of crime, illustrating the maxim that all truth and honor lie in temperance. For the honor of our race, we could wish that we had some better reason than that of charity to say that they were ignorant of history, and children in the knowledge of the world who innocently erred; but the ears of the fool and the cloven foot of the knave flaunt out too evidently from the sweet majesty of the simple and holy semblance of the lion of the Lord. Their infidelity renounces Christianity, their Atheism insults the Deity, and their arrogance installs themselves as apostles in the place of Christ, because Christ omitted to denounce slavery as a compact with hell. Such, then, must have been the character of the men with whom Mr. Dickens entrusted himself on his arrival. We doubt not Mr. Dickens was fêted in a princely style, and feasted on the most delicate wines and choice viands. Of course, he was honored with the devoted attentions of the gentlemen and the kisses of the fair. No doubt he was besieged with the agonizing sighs of old spinsters, and ogled with the dying-calf look of tender reproach by chaste prudes who thought it would be a delightful thing one day to surprise their staid lords with a saucy poet or dashing novelist, and make him think the brains of the Browns had not run out. Possibly but for this petting, the North would have been treated more gratefully by the author, and Southern institutions might have been pictured more favorably. As it is, Mr. Dickens complains of the utter want of an aristocracy at the North, and of the plebeian manners of that people, while he speaks contemptuously of a "clique of aristocratic pretenders" in the South. This charge we will not trouble ourselves with a refutation of, as regards the North; but as applied to the South, it is absurd. If Mr. Dickens means by aristocracy a privileged order, we agree with him perfectly; but if he means accomplished and educated people, he would be at no trouble

to find his superiors in *that* respect in every wealthy county in the South. As we have before said, and will again say, we have many distinguished persons in our country who are rough in their manners and too uncouth to please the ladies—but this is eccentricity. Mr. Dickens might have found among our Southern planters a society with as much polish and learning, and with as much genius and beauty, as any of which his own country could boast. Is it not a slander upon the Wirts, the Rutledges, the Legarès, the princely Lady Washington, the Fairfaxes, the Madisons and Clays, to say we have no genius or refinement. The natural effect of English climate and isolation is to make men boors. The natural effect of the Southern climate is to make men gentlemen. There, art has come to the assistance of climate and made the English a polished people; but if Mr. Dickens will visit the *whole* South, he will discover that nature has done *all that here*. It is a great error to assume that we have no ladies and gentlemen because we discard the Nel' Gwin style of dress for our ladies, and leave the blue and gold and buff and jingling chains to persons of "flash." If Mr. Dickens means by an aristocracy a cultivated society, we certainly have it in the highest perfection. But Mr. Dickens must not suppose that, because the South is not a beautiful garden like England, its people, therefore, want the first qualification of polish—good taste. Emigration will one day remedy this, when our wealth is no longer tributary to a foreign race. In the Northern districts he may see a rough, ignorant genius jump from the ox team to the Senate by some fortunate change in political affairs, and rare instances in the South, also; but is not Mr. Dickens old enough to know that one swallow does not make a summer?

In what does the superiority of English aristocracy consist? Is the highest class of English society composed of proud and profligate lords, hiding their want of knowledge and stupidity by looking wise and saying nothing, and concealing their want of polish by keeping aloof from the ill-bred; or does it consist of men whose manners are kind to all, of big intellects, learning and Spartan character? In Saint James' you may see splendid vehicles, stuck all over with heraldic pictures and liveried servants. Faultless horses, shining in harness of embossed silver, whirl along the easy chariot at the most exhilarating speed. His lordship's family within blaze with diamonds, and, perhaps, a foppish captain or two sits by their side to entertain the young ladies with something laughable. His lordship's mansion is modelled with all the style and taste and genius that Palladius could throw in his creations. The ceilings glow with rich frescoes; the walls rustle with painted tapestries, and the marble halls and chambers of an oriental seraglio are not more luxuriously furnished. Here, Gothic cases, pinnaled and carved with a tracery of ornaments, glow with a

sunset of gilding reflected from the backs of expensive books, and marble busts and the classic statues of the illustrious adorn the dim alcoves. There, the walls are hidden with rare paintings of old masters, and the floor is thick with groups of marble people, as if so many Aspasias or so many gods, at the very moment they showed the supreme grace of position and beauty of form, the blue veins coursing the alabaster, and all the breathing, look and life suddenly hardened in stone. Here, damask curtains, with their flowing cords and dangling tassels, tremble amidst the golden shadows that flash from the ornaments to which they are attached. There, you sink ankle-deep in the gorgeous Turkey, and cannot resist the repose that the profusion of arm-chairs, sofas and ottomans so temptingly offer. Here, chandeliers blaze with crystal and gold, and shining furniture of rosewood, and broad mirrors reflecting back the regal magnificence, astonish you; in a word, all the costly appointments that could embellish a palace that money could purchase or centuries produce. Here, you view parks and pleasure-grounds spreading over soil enough to make fifty Southern gentlemen wealthy. Groups of nymphs and marble fauns and satyrs stare from beneath the ancient shade-trees, and handsome cupids squirt up showers of diamonds, that fall in a misty sheet of rainbows to water the most splendid parterres of flowers. Groups of deer stand amidst sombre groves or stalk along cultivated glades, and on gala days fine chariots rattle along Macadamized avenues of ancient elms. Here, you see out-houses as fine as an American aristocrat's villa. There, pompous trains of servants as flashily dressed as a holiday general. Here, warrens alive with rabbits, stables stocked with blooded horses with pedigrees as pure and long as his lordship's; stalls of fat cattle, whose huge bulk of flesh and bone, and low-hanging milk-bags, are the results of the assiduous labors of his lordship's ancestry for nearly a thousand years. Here, flower-gardens, with walks exquisitely mosaiced, bloom beneath crystal cases built to shut out winter and preserve a piece of perpetual spring for his lordship's pleasure. Here, amid the broad banana leaves and blossoming thickets of orange and flowers, more curious and beautiful than the *espíritu sancto*, glitter the rich plumes of tropic birds and sound the classical notes of the nightingale. In a word, everything pleasant to the senses that enormous wealth can confer, is brought together to make one lord happy and a million of slaves wretched. Destroy the laws of entail and primogeniture and what becomes of these emparadised palaces of English noblemen. We abhor socialism, but we love a government that allows the wealth of the land to be distributed by the regular operations of legitimate commerce. American aristocracy, as Mr. Dickens terms it—this miserable spawn of a false republic—boasts no descent from a long line of ancestry, nor of

entailed inheritances that drive away the possibility of poverty. The chiefs who broke the prestige of British invincibility in our revolution give all the family glory we want, and the revenues of an honest industry all the wealth we desire. Our fathers were not delicately nursed in princely halls, nor did their eyes first open on frescoed ceilings, midst the officious attentions of fawning dependants. Their youth was not spent in indolent luxury and the cultivation of a tyrant heart. The princely estates that blessed them, the pious and affectionate families that smoothed their declining years, were not maintained by laws that discriminated against their fellow-beings. They did not coin in gold the blood the souls and sinews of a great nation, to support an idle and profligate aristocracy. They did not fill the land with an unnatural proportion of beggars, or the streets with beautiful women of ruined fame, who, instead of being ornaments, became the prostitutes of society to appease starvation. Their legislation never filled the prisons with thousands of men whose talents and moral worth would have brought them wealth and honor in a freer land. Their laws do not (as Mr. Dickens has eloquently proved the English do) shove little children on the cold charities of the world or compel infants to lisp pathetic falsehoods for bread, and, finally, grow up in crime and misery. Thank Heaven, we are free from these wailings and sufferings! Our statesmen, merchants and farmers of the olden time, first saw the light in rude, log houses. Their childhood was one of toil, and often on a glebe of sand or rocks; their recreations fishing with a crooked pin or hunting with an old musket—perhaps an heirloom of some patriot who fought at Eutaw. They read Virgil and Homer by the light of the pine-knots or crackle of the hickory, with the prattling children and gray-haired sires sitting around. Their food was coarse and their clothing rough. Their winter nights were devoted to study—their winter days to clearing away forests, where now stand fine cities. These are the proper contrasts between English and American aristocracy—and who could hesitate as to a choice? These were the fathers of the sons and daughters who now form the society of America, and where can more cultivation be found?

We are surprised that Mr. Dickens is so little a philosopher, and is at such a loss to apply what philosophy he has to the facts of history and workings of human nature, and from them draw a just and rational theory of society and government. We are surprised (knowing human nature so well, as his novels show, and describing so minutely the degrading situation of English slaves) that he should find so little to admire and so much to condemn in our institutions. We might say it is the eternal law of nature that the many should serve the few, and that it is the duty of philanthropists to ameliorate the condition of the man, just so far as they *can*, without disorganizing

society. We might say that the Southern system, considering its material, bears lighter on the laborer than any system yet known, and that a condition where the slaves are compelled to perform certain duties, and the masters assume certain responsibilities, is the best that can be devised for the heathen; and that as long as a portion of mankind were to remain servants, it were better to take them from inferior races. But we cannot believe the mass of the English people are so happy as the mass of our slaves, or that the English Government has done a title of what is in its power to soften the condition of its subjects to that degree of which it is susceptible.

What we have stated is not the effect of prejudice. If we have been severe, we have been truthful. If Mr. Dickens is familiar with the history of his country, he must be aware that a bloody tissue of crimes runs through the figures of her heroism and glory. It is hardly necessary to refer to the oppression and robberies in India; of Warren Hastings' tyranny, and the murder of so many oriental princes solely for their treasure. We will not refer to the American revolution. It may be out of place just now, since England is at last coming to appreciate us at our just value. But with all, England's history in the past is grand; her history in the future will be grander still. Her wars for liberty against the Spanish Philip, the wars for liberty against Louis XIV, her wars for liberty against Napoleon the Great, and the sublime heroism and self-sacrifice displayed in those contests, redeem her character. The Magna Charta and the inheritance of common law and constitutional government alone would bleach her sins into the whiteness of virtue. She has given the world the profoundest men of science, the most truthful philosophers, the best historians, the acutest statesmen and politico-economists—with a few exceptions—the most eloquent orators, the sweetest and sublimest poets, the greatest inventive genius, and in the arts of sculpture and painting alone has she been excelled. In country seats, in gardens, in parks, that embroider her rivers and lakes and make the land one beautiful pleasure ground—in all that relates to the art of living and the embellishment of life, she has not been approached.

America alone has rivalled her in invention. Italy alone has surpassed her in the fine arts. France alone has given birth to a greater general. She has produced one poet, whose creations would be literature enough for Spain or Germany to boast of. She has produced one philosopher, in whose works may be found the only philosophy that has been of any practical benefit to the world. She has produced one novelist, who unites in himself the classic richness, sanctified by truth and taste, and the wit and eloquence of all novelists. In no nation, ancient or modern, has there been such a fertile development or such a wide variety of genius. Her naval glory panegyric itself could

hardly exaggerate. And why has this all been? We answer: in the happy union of the Norman, the most elegant and chivalrous of races, and the Saxon, the most substantial and sensible of races. And yet the glory of England has not culminated. What a theme for poetry will her future history be. A thousand years will see her the mother of a hundred nations, more powerful and civilized than herself—a thousand years will exhibit Australia a continent of improved Englands, on a grander scale, quarrelling about the balance of power—a thousand years, and new British empires will rise in Japan and India; and Christianity, under the folds of St. George's cross, may resume her ancient inheritance—a thousand years, and mightier Englands will occupy the American continent; and the art and genius of her Wrens and Loudons will embellish the more beautiful scenery of southern latitudes. And all *these* will be freer and greater than England, and more wealthy and more lovely. With other things, humanity and the science of government will have advanced, and republics take the place of monarchies. Mr. Dickens will see that we are willing to do his own country justice. We will even go farther, and say that we would not willingly see Great Britain a democracy, until a greater development of civilization shall take away the risk of transformation. A sudden reform would be disastrous. The change from a monarchy, however free, to a republic, must be very gradual to prevent the danger of national extinction. We, therefore, think her present government the best for her people, considering the age in which we live, and the contracted limits of her insular empire.

England with all her faults, has enough of good to redeem her; and we have satirized those faults more to show the author of the "Notes on America" that recrimination is an easy accomplishment, than from any prejudice against that great nation. But, we must begin our conclusion with the observation that recrimination has never mended a fault or reformed those in error. Let the men of the South and the men of Britain prove their common descent from a noble ancestry, by the cultivation of good will and the interchange of kind acts. Let there be an affectionate alliance of their souls and a union of their power, in advancing constitutional freedom. We of the South boast of a pure English blood, undiluted by foreign mixture, and we venerate that merry old England, the mother of our dearest associations, our laws and literature, and religion and liberty; and should the trying day ever come when her existence shall be endangered by the assaults of more barbarous powers, she will find that Southern swords have edges keen, to find a way to the hearts of her enemies. We love old England for her William, who stood all odds for liberty against the overshadowing tyranny of France—we love her for her great minds and great deeds—we love her for the rich inheritances of thought, inven-

tion and discovery—we love her for Shakspeare—we love her for constitutional liberty. We know she has her faults—we know we have ours; but let not an uncharitable judgment of these make us enemies.

ART. III.—HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN EUROPE. BY M. GUIZOT.

The secret of social life, of animal life, and of vegetable life, elude all analysis. Much as men have thought and written and experimented on these subjects, they are as far to-day from knowing how to create a man, a society, or the minutest vegetable, as they were at the earliest dawn of history or tradition. Vital forces are hidden, and ever will be hidden, from mortal ken. Society is as old as man; it is a consequence of his nature, of his necessities, and of his instincts. Reason and design have nothing to do with its origin, and very little with its growth. Its improvement is always the result of accident or usurpation, and its decay and dissolution proceed from causes too subtle, too various, too complex or too profound, to be reached, detected, analyzed and expounded by human intellect. Society implies government: for there can be no government without one or many societies, and no society without government.

These truths were well understood in the days of Aristotle; but now-a-days men have grown rash, charlatanic and presumptuous, and are in a fair way to forget the art of government in the illusive Utopian pursuit of its science. There is not, and never can be, a science of medicine, of agriculture, or of government. They should be, and are, pursued by all wise and practical men as useful arts, not sciences.

There may be an imperfect system or science of law, but law is not all of government: and no system of law, or of government, was ever tolerated by a people unless it grew up insensibly, and without plan or design amongst them, or was imposed upon them by superior external force.

Law-makers see this, and meet once a year: not to make law, but to accept such changes as nature and circumstances require. Were there a science of legislation, they might make laws like the fabled ones of the Medes and Persians, never to be changed.

Legislation is pathological; it discovers no general, exact or universal truths, and hence adapts itself to varying circumstances as they arise, without the wisdom or the prescience to foresee them, and provide for them before they have arisen.

Jurisprudence is equally pathological, and equity has often to restrain or dispense with the imperfect and harsh provisions of the law. Man can tell what is right under present circum-

stances, but no two cases arise in all respects alike—so that he can establish no practical rule of right. This great truth is admitted, and carried into practice by the frequent changes of law; and by the necessity to have a dispensing power or court of equity, to relieve from the written law when it would operate iniquitously. *Equity is the pathology of law*; and jurists who admit the necessity of equity, unconsciously assert that law is not a science.

The doctors are ahead, in thought and theory, of the lawyers, though behind them in practice. The dispensing power, whether prætor, king, emperor or chancellor, is as old as history; but lawyers, legislators and statesmen never knew what it meant. The doctors have evinced more philosophical acumen, and have invented the terms nosology and pathology—that is, the law and equity of medicine. They are learned, philosophical, modest, and honest enough to admit that they know so little of human life and health that they dare not practice on general rules, and must treat symptoms as they arise, regardless of the name, class, or nosology of the disease. The lawyers are conceited, dogmatical, charlatanic, and believe in fixed rules of right and wrong, although their whole practice, as legislators or judges, is founded on and carries out the opposite principle. They practised pathology long before the doctors taught it, but have ever been as unconscious of the fact as the peasant who was surprised to learn that he had all his life been speaking the English language.

As for the farmers, they have always been more sensible men than lawyers or doctors, and have rejected with disdain scientific agriculture, the nosology of farming, which they contemptuously dub mere book-farming, and adopted and practised the pathological or experimental system. With them their profession has ever been treated as an art, not a science.

There is no such thing as moral, medical or agricultural science, and never can be; because man is ignorant, and must ever remain ignorant of the vital forces that originate and sustain societies, animals and vegetables. Were it possible for him to detect them, he might create a vegetable, and give it life and growth—make a man, and breathe into him a living soul; or, what is far more difficult, make a society or government which is compounded of many individuals, and embraces all the complexities of individual as well as of social life. Society is a God-created being, like hives and herds and flocks, and it would be less absurd and presumptuous to attempt to create the individuals who constitute a society in the segregate, than the social being which is their compound and aggregate.

It does not follow, because government is a natural and original condition of mankind, that, therefore, nothing can be done from time to time to better adapt and improve it. All of human life is a ceaseless struggle between fate and free will.

Providence, in the main, prescribes our condition as individuals or as nations, but leaves much room for voluntary action, and requires it of us as a condition of our well-being, that we should be ever struggling against the evils that surround us. How much our career in life is the result of circumstance and necessity; how much depends on our own exertions, we can never know; yet, are all conscious that we are responsible beings, free, in general, to pursue this or that mode of action, and dependent for success in life on our own exertions. We may fail despite of exertion, but cannot succeed without it. "A Paul may plant and an Apollos water, but God alone can give the increase." Yet Paul must plant and Apollos water, or there will surely be no increase. Government cannot be made by man, but he must be continually mending it, pruning it, or adding to it, or it will be sure to go to speedy ruin. We must physic nature; not attempt to create it or expel it.

The statesmen of the South are eminently conservative and experimental, and disposed to retain all institutions that have worked well in practice, however unreasonable they may seem in theory. Our new constitution differs little from that of the United States, which worked well, until a sectional majority arose at the north with institutions, feelings, interests and political doctrines, differing from ours. It is sufficient for the present to get rid of the tyrannical dominion of that inimical section, and to change our system gradually hereafter only when necessity and experience shall dictate the propriety of change.

It has been well remarked that any existing government, unless it be that of one nation over another, is better suited to the people over whom it presides than any entirely new form of government that the wit of man could devise for such a people. In other words, that any prescriptive, natural government that has grown up by degrees, is preferable to any that man can contrive. Our institutions were imported from England, or have grown up at home. Let us be cautious how we change them.

The work of M. Guizot on the origin of representative government, comprises a revision and embodiment of a series of lectures which he delivered in 1820, '21 and '22. It is as a whole, a very indifferent book, although abounding with brilliant passages, sage reflections, and profound philosophic truths, and, besides, evincing great learning, industry and curious research. It lacks continuity and connection. The author has collected rich materials from a thousand sources, but we do not see that he has made any use of them in erecting or sustaining the theory which he advances. There is no chain of argument that connects his various, suggestive and learned premises with his lame and impotent conclusions. In very truth, he is a French socialist and perfectionist, and although a man of vast

ability, yet sees everything through the distorted medium of a false philosophy. He would, if offered the opportunity, make governments to order for all sorts of people as fast as an undertaker turns out coffins, or as Locke or Abbé Sieges could make constitutions "warranted not to fit." The peculiar type of political mania under which he labors was carried from America to France by Jefferson, Franklin and Lafayette. It found there a congenial soil and clime, spread faster than small pox, cholera or yellow fever, and would be spreading still but for the sagacious, bold and successful practice of Louis Napoleon. This form of madness was alike in all the patients, in this, that each declared he had discovered a system of government which would prove an infallible cure for all social diseases, and quite banish moral evil; but no two of these lunatics ever proposed the same system. The representative system that has imperceptibly grown up in England, is our author's panacea. He believes it is suited for all times, places and peoples, and is quite lachrymose at the folly and wickedness of Louis Napoleon and the French people, who, wholly unconscious of its beauties and its blessings, banished it from France.

The attempt of one people to copy and introduce the institutions of another, has been treated by practical statesmen as a proverbial absurdity for thousands of years; yet Guizot wonders at and deplures the failure of an experiment which has always failed whenever tried.

This thing of government-making would be the easiest thing in the world, if one could make the men to be governed; for then one should know the value, force and adaptation of the materials out of which we proposed to rear our edifice. To build a government or society, we must begin by constructing its separate parts; the integers or individuals who are to compose it. That is the way God Almighty makes governments or societies, and man will never effect it by taking a shorter cut. Until he can go to work in the same way, he must be content to accept government, ready made, from the hand of God.

The following quotation from the preface will give the reader a faint idea of the peculiar hallucination under which M. Guizot labors: "When, in the year 1820, I devoted my energies to this course of instruction, I was taking leave of public life, after having, during six years, taken an active part in the work of establishing representative government in our land. The political ideas and friends with whom I had been associated, were, at that period, removed from the head of affairs. I connected myself with their reverses without abandoning our common hopes and efforts. We had faith in our institutions. Whether they entailed upon us good or evil fortune, we were equally devoted to them. I was unwilling to cease to serve their cause. I endeavored to explain the origin and principles of representative government, as I had attempted to practise it."

"How shall I speak, at the present day, of bad fortune and reverse, in reference to 1820? What shall we say of the fate that has recently overtaken our father-land, and of that which is, perhaps, in store for us? It is a shame to make use of the same words in respect to evils and dangers so prodigiously unequal. In truth, the trials of 1820 were severe and painful, yet the state was not thrown into confusion by them, and they were followed by ten years of regular and free government. In 1830, a still severer trial, the test of revolution, was applied to our noble institutions and they did not succumb; they shook off the revolutionary yoke, and gave us eighteen years more of order and liberty. From 1814 to 1848, notwithstanding so many violent convulsions, constitutional monarchy remained standing, and events justified the obstinacy of our hopes. But now the storm has struck every institution, and still threatens to destroy all that survive. Not merely kings and laws, but the very root of government, of all government. What do I say? The roots of society itself have been reached, and are left bare and almost torn up. Can we again seek safety at the same source? Can we still believe and hope in representative government and monarchy?"

We differ with Guizot as to representative government. We don't think representative government is an English discovery. We believe all government is, or should be, representative. We think the father and husband the only natural, proper and reliable representative of his wife and children—appointed by nature, not elected by wife and children. We believe the master to be the natural, and only safe and reliable representative of his slaves—the lord or baron the representative of his serfs and vassals—the Roman senator or patrician the representative of his clients, freedmen and slaves—and the king or emperor the representative of all his subjects. We believe that equals never did, and never will, honestly and fairly represent their equals; for equals are competitors, rivals and enemies, struggling to advance themselves by injuring each other. The king, the nobility and clergy, honestly and fairly represent the interests of the laboring classes of England; but the House of Commons, emanating from that class, is its dire enemy, and only represents the bankers, farmers, landlords and other capitalists of the nation. The House of Commons preceded by a century pauperism in England. But for that house, there never would have been pauperism there—for king, lords and clergymen would have extended equal protection to all, and never suffered a parcel of roguish commoners to have grown fat by despoiling their equals, the laboring class. The French Revolution of '93 brought about the same result there. The shopkeepers and petty landholders, bankers and other capitalists, were put in power. The *bourgeoise* were substituted for king, bishops and nobility—the wolves for the lions—the natural friends, parents

and protectors of the people for their mean, natural and contemptible enemies, parvenus and upstarts, elected from their own body. The true representative must be a superior—a king, a lord, a bishop, or a master—some one who best advances his own interests by taking care of the interests of his constituents; one who is not paid for his services—for if his interest in the public weal be not large enough to justify his giving his services, he is apt to swindle the people whom he affects to represent. He is sure not to levy high taxes where his part of the tax would exceed his salary. But where he is poor and has little or nothing to tax, but much to gain from taxation, by providing fat offices for his children, cousins and base tools who elect him to office, he will, therefore, ever be ready to vote for the heaviest system of taxation. The Southern master, the Roman senator, and the English baron, always opposed heavy taxes, because they had to pay them; or, to speak more accurately, heavy taxes by government lessened the profits which they derived from their slaves, tenants, vassals and other dependants. The interests of superior and inferior, of landlord and tenant, of king and subject, of patrician and plebeian, of lord and vassal, of bishop and laity, of father and children, of husband and wife, are indissolubly tied up together; and the former will feelingly and honestly represent, advocate and advance, the interests of the latter: because they thereby take care of and advance their own interests. But equals are always rivals, competitors and enemies; and when one of the poor is chosen to represent the poor, he never fails to fleece, oppress and swindle them, for that is the only way in which he can use his office for self-promotion.

Representative government did not begin in England. It is natural and has been universal. Diseased society brought forth the House of Commons, the tools of the moneyed class; and this house has so neglected and oppressed the laboring people, that a fourth power has arisen in the nation. The laborers, finding that they had no voice or influence, and little sympathy, in government, have banded themselves into trades unions, in order to take care of their own interests. There was no necessity for this until the king was stripped of his prerogative, the baron of his serfs and vassals, and the church of its lands. Until then, every man in England had his place, his home, his protector, his means of certain support, by light and easy labor. Until then, there were no paupers or poor-houses in England; because, until then, it was the interest and duty and obligation of the rich and powerful to take care of the poor; because, until then, every laborer was naturally and properly represented by a superior whose interests cohered with those of the laborer.

Actual representation ended just where nominal representation begun. We do not wish to appropriate the credit of origi-

nality when it is not due to us. Fanny Wright, afterward Mrs. Darasmont, is the author from whom we borrow our theory. She thinks representation in England was perfect in the time of the old barons, when every man had a master or was a master; and that it ceased when the vassals or serfs were liberated, outlawed, and deprived of all certain means of livelihood. Up to this point, we agree cordially with Miss Wright—nay, we agree further with her, that the present state of things in England, and in all other countries of Europe where the serfs have been liberated, is an intolerable condition, a mere transition state, destined to usher in a better state of things. At this point, however, we differ widely. She thinks the next step is to an untried condition of social equality; we think the next step will be a return to slavery,—the natural, normal, and, in general, necessary condition of society.

Louis Napoleon fairly, honestly and wisely represents the interests of all the people of France, and is most attentive to those of the "*ouvriers*" or laboring class, because they are most numerous, and, when called into action, most powerful. He convenes his council, and consults with the wisest and most practical men from every part of France, in order to ascertain and advance the true interests of the great masses—the laborers—who constitute the bone and sinew of society. His government is parental and representative in reality, not merely in name. The miserable thing called representative government, under the restored Bourbons and Louis Phillipe, which Guizot admires, was the rule of the middle classes, the meanest part of society; of the wolf over the lamb—of the men who live by exploiting instead of protecting labor. It was intolerable, because it put the meanest (*the bourgeoisie*) upmost.

Russia, since the days of Peter the Great, has been purely and honestly and indefatigably a representative government. Men have been summoned from every part of the empire, and consulted as to the wishes and interests of their different localities—honest, truthful, well-informed men; not mere political speculators and swindlers, such as the people are but too apt to elect. There is not a government in all Germany that is not more really and honestly representative than that of England. In Germany, Prussia, Austria, Holland, Belgium and Switzerland, government looks to and takes care of poor as well as rich. In England, the poor are ignored; consequently, there are more helpless, outlawed, dependent, perhaps, in England, Scotland and Ireland, than in the whole of the rest of Europe. The so-called representative government of England is the best in the world, for the rich who do not labor—the worst in the world, for the poor who do labor. It is the least representative government that has ever existed, because it represents fewest of the people. Guizot has been deceived by a name. His English representative government is strictly and *practically misrep-*

representative. It was found to be so in France. We could adduce abundance of French authorities to prove our position, had we time and space. The revolution of '93 dethroned king, nobility and church—the natural friends of the working people—and put in power their natural, mean and implacable enemies, the shopmen, little landlords and capitalists. Guizot's representative system is accurately defined in the trite adage, "*Luus a lucendo*." Were he in the habit of reasoning from his premises, he would have discovered that all governments in a healthy and normal state, were essentially the same, for he says: "The two facts—society and government—mutually imply one another. Society without government, is no more possible than government without society. The very idea of society implies that of rule, of universal law—that is to say, of government. This necessary coexistence of society and government, shows the absurdity of the hypothesis of the social contract." Now, as government is natural to men, and men's natures, habits, wants, passions, virtues, vices and propensities are as much alike as those of bees, ants, beavers, or any other social animals, it would seem to follow that the social forms and government of different nations must be naturally, and, when in a healthy state, as much alike as those of other gregarious animals. We have tried in former essays to furnish conclusive proof of this position, by showing that the same institutions, under different names, were to be found among all civilized nations, and that these institutions were all prescriptive, as old as man himself, as far as we could learn from history or tradition.

The representative system of the South is like that of England in her feudal times. The representatives own the lands and laborers, and may be safely trusted to represent, provide for, and take care of what is their own. The representative system of ancient Rome in her palmy days was like ours, but more perfect than ours. The patricians owned, in some sense, all the classes below them, either as slaves, clients, freedmen, wives or children, or other dependants.

The Russian nobility must have represented admirably their serfs, who constitute the bulk of the people, or Russia would not have grown and improved so rapidly. But the emperor has caught the Jeffersonian-French fever, and is determined to liberate and outlaw the serfs, just as they have been liberated and outlawed in southern Europe. When they begin to starve, as starve they must, there will arise a plentiful crop of trades unions, red republican hymns, riots, barricades and bloody revolutions, besides guillotines and poor-houses.

In the following passage, the author had liked to have stumbled upon a great and valuable truth: "The age in which we live has taken too much pains to seek guaranties in physical force, and has neglected to seek for them in moral ideas. In barbarian times, as all powers, both of kings and subjects, are

almost equally unregulated, they appear bad guaranties to sensible men, who seek for purer sureties in moral ideas." Now, if he meant by "moral ideas" the instinctive feelings, affections and sympathies which are common, in more or less degree, to all mankind, and which induce the strong, wise and powerful to protect and take care of the weak and dependent; and, on the other hand, impel the weak and ignorant to look up to, respect and obey those above them in authority, wisdom, strength or position. If this were what he meant, then he would have discovered and announced a great and valuable truth—then he would have found out that "strength of weakness" with which nature has invested women, children, subjects, slaves and other dependants, that operates to restrain, check and balance the power of superiors far better than any human legislation. God made society, with all the necessary checks and balances, and human law but enforces nature when it punishes crime—for crime is abnormal and unnatural. Man's benevolent affections, his social, and "*antiselfish*" nature, usually restrain him from abuse of power—not some vague and undiscovered standard of right and justice which Utopians like Guizot are ever pursuing and never attain. This imaginary standard constitutes what he calls "moral ideas." To make this clearer, we will cite another passage, in which he fully discloses himself as a visionary perfectionist: "The historic school professes other characteristics, and falls into different errors. With the utmost respect for facts, it easily allows itself to be induced to attribute to them merits to which they are not entitled—to see more reason and justice, that is to say, more right, in them than they really contain, and to resist even the slightest bold attempt to judge and regulate them according to principles more conformable to general reason. It is even inclined to deny those principles, to maintain that *there is no rational and invariable type of right that man can take as a guide in his efforts or his opinions—an error of great magnitude, and sufficient to place this school, philosophically considered, in a subordinate rank. What, then, is perfection, if there is no ideal perfection to be arrived at? What is the progress of real rights, if there is no rational right to comprehend them all? What is the human mind, if it is incapable of penetrating beyond actual realities in its knowledge of this actual right? And how can it judge of them except by comparing them with this sublime type, which it never holds in full possession, but which it cannot deny without abnegating itself, and losing every fixed rule and guiding thread.* Doubtless, facts command respect, because they are a condition, a necessity; and they deserve it, because they always contain a certain measure of right. But the judgment ought never to be enslaved by them, nor should it attribute absolute legitimacy to reality. Is it so difficult, then, to perceive that

evil is evil, even when it is powerful and inevitable? The historic school constantly endeavors to evade this confession."

We informed the reader, at the outset, that M. Guizot was a political monomaniac. We are sure the above quotation will suffice to prove that we have not misrepresented him. His "rational and invariable type of right" is an absurdity which none but a madman would go in quest of.

The historic school, which he condemns, is the tory party of England, the conservative secession party of the South—the party to which we are proud to belong, the party of Moses and Solomon and Aristotle. The party to which he belongs, is that of half-demented socialists and perfectionists.

His notions of good and evil are unphilosophical, and contradicted by all human experience. Evil is but excess of good. There is nothing good or evil in itself, in the abstract. Opposing, antagonistic powers and principles sustain the physical and the moral world. The undue preponderance of any one principle or power constitutes evil, and brings on decay and death. Good is but the just equilibrium between opposing qualities or powers. In the moral and the physical world, everything is good, when duly balanced and proportioned, in combination and in the concrete. Nothing exists, or can exist, in the abstract; there is, therefore, nothing good or evil in itself. We don't think with Pope, that "whatever is, is right." There is always, with men, a tendency to excess, and consequent wrong. But we must not try to expel anything that is natural. All of man's passions, appetites, feelings and propensities were given to him for good, wise and necessary purposes; they are none evil when not excessively indulged; and moral duty is performed when we balance them properly, not by eradicating any of them.

We were disposed to think Carlyle's account of the origin of the British Parliament somewhat apocryphal until we read M. Guizot. Carlyle says that, in the beginning, the Parliament was a mere Christmas or holiday frolic, attended by all the noble, rich and powerful of the kingdom, where, between their cups, all affairs of state were discussed and determined on. And that to make sure of coming to wise conclusions, the king and his festive counsellors first deliberated in a drunken symposium, then reconsidered matters in grave and sober assemblage, and lastly, came to firm resolves in a half drunken frolic. It is a little remarkable that the old Persians, the ancient Germans, and the Canadian Indians, deliberated also on public affairs, first drunk and then sober, and that even the heathen gods, when matters of grave import required them to consult together, celebrated the occasion by a great feast.

Guizot gives the following account of the primitive Parliaments, under Norman rule:

"*Curia de more, curia regis*, signified, originally, neither merely the privy council of the king nor his tribunal; it was evidently a grand assembly, at which all the nobles of the kingdom were present, either to treat of the affairs of state or to assist the king in the administration of justice. 'The king,' says the Saxon Chronicle, 'was wont to wear his crown three times a year—at Easter, at Winchester; at Whitsuntide, in Westminster; at Christmas, in Gloucester; and then there were present with him all the great men of all England—archbishops and bishops, abbots and counts, thanes and knights.' 'A royal edict,' says William, of Malmesbury, 'called to the *curia de more* all the nobles, of every grade, in order that those sent from foreign countries might be struck with the magnificence of the company, and with the splendor of the festivities.' All the nobles of the kingdom came, according to usage, to the king's court on the day of our Saviour's nativity. Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, having presented himself *ad curiam pro more*, was received with joy by the king and all the nobility of the kingdom. In 1100, at Christmas, the kingdom of England assembled at London, according to custom, at the king's court."

We are about to conclude this essay by giving the concluding part of a letter written by the celebrated Hineman, archbishop of Rheims, in 882, sixty-eight years after the death of Charlemagne, descriptive of the *quasi*-Parliaments of that great prince. This description, we think, will incline the reader to believe that Charlemagne's practice of representative government was very superior to M. Guizot's dazzling and confused theory about it. Yet his book is exceedingly interesting and instructive. Full of curious historic research, profound reflections, sparkling epigram, and glowing rhetoric.

Hineman informs us that Charlemagne convened two vast assemblages annually, to consult and get information as to the state of the kingdom. He enters into a very minute description of the various classes and persons who compose those meetings, and gives a lively and graphic account of their proceedings after they had met. We have room only for the concluding portion of his letter:

"Whilst these affairs were thus arranged out of the presence of the king, the prince himself, in the midst of the multitude that had come to the general assembly, was busy in receiving presents, greeting the most important individuals, conversing with those whom he saw but seldom, exhibiting an affectionate interest in the old, laughing and joking with the young, and doing these and similar things to ecclesiastics as well as laymen. However, if those who were deliberating upon the matters submitted to their judgment desired it, the king went to them, and remained with them as long as they wished; and there they reported to him, with entire familiarity, what they

thought of various matters, and about even the friendly discussions that had arisen amongst them.

"I must not forget to mention that, if the weather were fine, all this went on in the open air; but, if not, in several distinct buildings, by which those who had to deliberate on the king's propositions were separated from the multitude of persons who had come to the assembly, and these the less important men could not enter. The building intended for the meeting of the nobles was divided into two parts, so that the bishops, abbots, and superior clergy could meet together without any mixture of laymen. In the same way, the counts and other distinguished persons of the state separated themselves in the morning from the rest of the multitude, until the time came when, whether the king were present or absent, they all met together; and then the nobles above mentioned, the clergy on their side, and the laymen, on theirs, proceeded to the hall which was assigned to them, and where seats had been honorably prepared for them. When the lay and ecclesiastical lords were thus separated from the multitude, it was in their power to sit either together or separately, according to the nature of the affairs which they had to discuss, whether ecclesiastical, secular, or mixed. In the same way, if they wished to send for any one, either to bring them food (*quære*, also drink), or to answer any question, and to dismiss him after they had attained what they desired, it was in their power so to do. Thus proceeded the examination of the affairs, which the king proposed for their deliberation.

"The second occupation of the king was, to demand from each what he had to report or relate to him regarding that part of the kingdom from which he had come; not only was this permitted to all, but they were, specially enjoined to make inquiries, during the interval between the assemblies, about what was going on both within and without the kingdom; and they were to seek information from foreigners as well as natives, from enemies as well as friends: sometimes by employing envoys, and without being very scrupulous as to the way in which the information was obtained. The king desired to know whether, in any district or corner of his kingdom, the people were murmuring or disaffected, and what was the cause of their disaffection; and whether any disorder had occurred which required the attention of the general council, and other like details. He also sought to know whether any of the conquered nations were likely to revolt, or whether any that had revolted seemed disposed to submit, or whether those that still remained independent threatened the kingdom with any attack, etc. Upon all these matters, whenever disorder or danger appeared, his chief care was to learn what was the motive or occasion thereof."

No wonder he was called Charles the Great. His parliament,

or congress, or assembly, was composed of candid, truthful, honest, well-informed men. Men who possessed valuable and peculiar information on every subject relating to the common weal. There was not a stump orator among them; not one of that windy, verbose genus, who pretend to know everything, and really know nothing, except to crack jokes, speak to Buncombe, and get fat jobs and offices for their relations and dependants, male and female. The stump orator of our day is generally a vulgar, ignorant, brazen-faced attorney; often half parson and half Thompsonian doctor, who has picked up witticisms from the clown in the circus, the razor-strop man, and the negro auctioneer; and picked up law from Henning's Justice, the clerks, and deputy sheriffs. He is fully as well fitted to play colonel or major-general as anything else, and seeing that law is at a discount, and war in the ascendant, he generously offers to go to the war, provided he can get profitable employment. He could not make a pair of negro's brogues for his life, because he never learned how, but is ready to command an army, of which he knows less than of shoemaking. The camp is a better school in which to make a soldier than West Point; but these stump orators, who propose to lead armies, were half of them never in camp. Our Western volunteer officers, who have fought the Indians, fought in Texas, in Mexico and California; who have lived from boyhood in the midst of danger, with their arms under their pillows, are admirable soldiers, and well fitted for command; but Eastern stump orators are not fitted to make or to mend shoes, to make or to mend laws, to lead armies, nor to do anything useful. Let them stick to their vocation, and make silly speeches for Buncombe, and perpetrate stale witticisms for the mob. We would not give a cent for our institutions, if corrupt and ignorant stump orators, like Lincoln, are not speedily whistled down the wind. But we hope and trust, "there is a good time coming!"

ART. IV.—SHALL WE HAVE A NAVY? SHALL WE PURSUE THE DEFENSIVE POLICY, OR INVADE THE ENEMY'S COUNTRY?

So long as a people can control their own actions it is safe to consider they will be governed by their own material interests—they will seek to promote them. But, there are times when they *cannot* control their actions; and the failure in the people of the South to recognize this great truth, is the source of all their troubles and all their dangers. As in the life of Ensau, there was a time when he could but *would not*, and a time when he would, but *could not*, so there is in every man's life such periods; and as men make up a nation, a people; there are in the history of every people such periods, and these

periods, whether the actors so recognize them or not, historians denominate *epochs*. To prove what I say, for profit and instruction, not in any fault-finding spirit, let us recur to the history of the few past years. It is well known that every effort made by the noble and self-sacrificing men of the South to arouse her people to approaching dangers, was made of none effect and rendered abortive by the one argument that, on the approach of real danger, the South could save herself—could control her destiny through her staple productions. No matter how many and how vital the rights of which she was deprived—no matter how many nor how humiliating the wrongs to which she was required to submit, nor how fatal the violations of that constitution, intended as the shield and protector of her rights and liberties and independence, the conclusive and all-sufficient answer was, the South had nothing of real danger to apprehend for her staples were her strength—these were to her the locks of Samson, and of which she could not be shorn, because she alone had the climate and the system of labor to produce them. Her people, as fond of the syren song of peace and continuing prosperity as her bad men were of position, of the honors and emoluments of office, confided in this assurance. And hence no appeals, however eloquent or patriotic, no voice, however prophetic, in behalf of “truth, justice and the constitution,” could arouse her people from the false security—the fatal lethargy into which this idea had lulled them. Eyes they had to see, but perceived not—ears to hear, but understood not. This idea in its full force, was presented to the North by Mr. Calhoun; and although utterly disregarded by them, our people still, as if determined to be dupes, rested their all upon this assurance. The people of the North knew who paid the taxes (rather tribute) to support the government, and knew well the system of robbery that enriched them. They knew as well as we, the indispensable condition of their prosperity was the prosperity and peace of the South and the preservation of her institutions and system of labor. But none can now deny that the people of the North have resolved upon the *extirpation* of slavery, and, also, if needs be, the *extermination* of the South. Because their fortunes vacillate in the border states, they profess otherwise; but he who can believe such profession can believe anything. Where, now, is the reliance of the South? She does not depend upon the strength of her staples to extort from her enemies recognition of her rights, and liberties, and independence, but upon the valor of her sons and the death-dealing implements of war. And unless we triumph in a separation final and complete, and free from dependence upon that people in any manner, shape or form, had not the voice of inspiration declared otherwise, I should believe our condition, sooner or later, would become more intolerable than that of the people of Judea, when their chief city was beleaguered by the victorious Romans,

under the command of Titus. I say sooner or later, because other people may be enemies in war, and in peace friends; but the people of the North, unlike any other people, are enemies in peace as well as in war.

In an article on the Confederate States constitution, in the September number of De Bow's Review, in an article upon our true position, in the October and November number of the same, in tracing the causes it was attempted to explain why we could not safely rely upon our staples for the protection of our rights and liberties, safety and independence. And, in confirmation of the truthful illustration of the operation of the causes assigned, I appeal to the highest authority, Mr. Calhoun—to him of whom it has been so justly said, while liberty has had many friends and many martyrs, it may well be doubted if, excepting him, it ever had a genuine apostle. And, after all, the great event the contest in which we are now engaged, will decide, "is whether Mr. Calhoun shall go down to posterity portrayed in the colors of the Gracchi of the patricians, or of the Gracchi of the people." I quote from his Disquisition upon Government, volume first of his works. After assigning the causes that are at work, and must continue to work, in solving the question: what forms will governments assume, those of the form monarchy, or of the more liberal form, he remarks the interval—the period of transition between the decay of the old and the formation of the new, will be one of *uncertainty, confusion, error, and wild and fierce fanaticism*. That governments of the more civilized are *now* in the midst of this period, and through this period *few* will be able successfully to pass. I wish all could and would read the whole, especially from page 85 to 91 inclusive.

We have seen how fatal has been our reliance upon our staples as regards the North. Shall we affirm the same reliance in regard to foreign powers? True, it would seem England's population to a greater extent than that of the North, being dependent upon the manufacture of our staple, cotton, for bread, might make our cause rather more favorable, as the North can turn her operations to agricultural pursuits, having the soil for the purpose, and keep up her armies also. Still, the North must have clothing as well as England; and England, too, may need armies, and if she took for her armies the male population engaged in such pursuits, and which for want of supplies they must abandon, and, for bread must enter the army, it would not be a greater increase of the standing armies of Europe proportionably than what we behold is the increase on this continent, and the remaining operatives might find a supply in East India cotton, and our cotton remaining blocked up, would at once give England the monopoly of the cotton market—a result long coveted—an object long struggled for. But even now, while I am writing, our people believe England and France,

and, perhaps, Spain, have recognized us as a people—from this they infer the blockade by foreign interposition will be raised, and, probably, a war between England and the United States will follow, opening to us the prospect of an early peace. If so, I shall rejoice. But if our independence be recognized and the blockade be raised, what will it prove? Why, simply that the North could not do what foreign powers could—control their own actions, and were governed by their own material interests—not that our staples were all-sufficient for our safety and independence. How long it will be that foreign powers can control their actions I cannot say; but if the causes assigned by Mr. Calhoun continue to operate, and it would seem they must, looking to the future as dependent upon existing causes, it cannot be long, in all human probability, unless the rulers of foreign powers can consent, in deference to the increasing demands which a sound public opinion and an increasing diffusion of light and intelligence will continue, to make concessions by which they will be shorn of absolute power. My object and desire are that the South should prepare in earnest for a struggle which neither time, nor change, nor chance, can avert. It is a mistaken idea—nonsense to believe that the statesmen of Great Britain were influenced themselves by fanaticism in the abolition of African slavery in her provinces. It is nonsense to believe Brougham in earnest when he introduced the sable doctor to Mr. Dallas, because he thought the blacks and whites were equals. Every act of his life belies his belief to that effect. He is honored by a government he has labored all his life to sustain, and upholds a government that denies equality among its own people. Her people demanded concessions, and, under the influence of a mistaken zeal, or, if you please, fanaticism which Wilberforce taught them, this would be a concession to them; and, as this would satisfy the demand, the concession was made. Her statesmen saw, it would not essentially impair the power of her rulers; and though it cost heavily and added to the public debt, if they did not act wisely they did well; for they knew instead of weakening the rulers, it only would add to the burdens of the people who forced the concessions, and who would themselves have it to pay for. I will not cavil about the meaning of such words as fanaticism, but we should endeavor to ascertain the true cause, and not place the effect for the cause, nor make the cause the effect. And, looking back upon the events of that period, one may reasonably conclude that by such a concession on the part of the rulers of France, at the proper moment, in regard to the slaves of San Domingo, the horrors of that island and of France, during the reign of terror, might have been averted. Now, the people of the North—I mean their leaders—in their efforts to avoid the calamities of France at the period referred to and those that threatened England, have sought to control the mis-

taken zeal of the masses which they have cultivated—first, as demagogues to attain position and to rob the South, but now really to abolish slavery in the South. To form an idea of the cause that impels them to seek this result, we must remember they had for years adopted a policy to rob and plunder the South, leading to a state of revolution and anarchy in its consequences among their own people. And when they adopted the principle that they would govern by the *will of the majority*—that their will and *not* the constitution should be the rule of their conduct in order to reach us, they overleaped the last barrier between themselves and anarchy.

In obedience to this rule of conduct the minority had to be sacrificed, and, under existing prejudices, the minority of slaveholders were destined to be the first victims. But the exercise of the right of *secession* prevented this fatal consequence—a consequence which, in the end, would have been fatal to the rights and liberties of us all. Now they find the owners of Fifth avenue palaces, of splendid equipages, of liveried slaves; and princely merchants and real estate owners, are the minority to be sacrificed. To avoid such a result can we be surprised in preference they wage war upon us, disregarding even its civilized rules, and make rapine and plunder, beauty and booty, their watch-word. The very men who perpetrate such crimes upon us would do the same upon their own people, if turned loose at home; and hence, if war be a calamity, anarchy is a far greater calamity—for *anarchy is death*.

“A universe of death, which God by curse
Created evil, for evil only good,
Where all life dies, death lives, and nature breeds,
Perverse, all monstrous, all prodigious things,
Abominable, unutterable, and worse
Than fable yet have feign’d or fear conceived,
Gorgons, and hydras, and chimeras dire.”

There are times when necessity knows no law — when all considerations of material interests are discarded when a people cannot control their actions, and this I call the inexorable necessity that disregards everything but self-preservation; which is not, as is said, a law of our nature, for a law is founded upon reason; it is the instinct of our nature, and hence the inexorable necessity knows no law. The people of France, in the last century, adopted the will of the majority as the rule of their conduct. But conflicting interests were there, as everywhere else there will be, and the majority soon perceived they had but to will it to promote their own interests at the expense of the interests of the minority.

The minority was crushed, but power, always seeking its own aggrandizement, turned, and, in its turn, crushed the interests of the majority with the attributes with which it had been clothed by that very majority to crush the minority. Then followed scenes such as a state of anarchy alone can pre-

sent, until at last, "bleeding at every pore, France fled for protection to the sword of the practical man, Napoleon the Great." From what did she flee? From her majority government. And so, in our own day and time, when a second time the French people proclaimed the empire, it was not because they loved liberty less—not to preserve the rights and liberties of a free people—but to preserve law and order, and again repudiated a majority government. As the great commoner, Roanoke Randolph, said, one king is preferable to king numbers. The North have one chance of escape. War strengthens power while it enfeebles liberty, and if they can continue the war until the one-man government can be consolidated so as to preserve itself, they may escape from the horrors of king numbers, fleeing to one king. And now the solemn question here presents itself: if such be true, would it not be the height of folly and stupidity to think again of forming a connection with a people who, driven by the inexorable necessity, unable to control their own actions—unable to regard their material interests—prosecute against us a cruel and infamous war, and would cheerfully sacrifice everything to sacrifice us? The treason of Arnold could not have proved more fatal to his country. But a separation, final and complete, is not all. I cannot believe we have any right, in the nature of things, to look for protection from foreign powers in Europe. Nor can I say I should desire to see a war between England and the United States. After war comes peace, and how that peace may effect us we do not know. If we had a navy, we could conveniently fight the United States for years; and a navy we *must* have. I never wish to see the decision of 1812 and 1815 reversed, when the exultant voice of Calhoun, then music to us all, announced "the charm of British naval invincibility is gone." Wherever England extends her protection, there she plants the ensign of her dominion. If, as Mr. Calhoun says, causes will continue to operate, the effects of which must be to lead to demands for ameliorations in government, and as the South is the great *motor* power which drives the locomotive of progress and civilization, diffusing light and intelligence, tending to diminish the power of rulers and to elevate the ruled, and being the last and only home of liberty, we cannot hope to exist as a people long by *mere sufferance*. There is but one other spot where Great Britain can again make pretended concessions to her people by abolishing African slavery. But look at the result. Let us move onward in peace, and with an unfettered commerce, we will export 300,000,000, and buy 150, say 200,000,000—how long before the specie basis of trade and commerce of Europe would be transferred to the Confederate States? If, as I have heard it estimated, that basis is 800,000,000, in eight years it would be transferred to us. Not without a struggle to prevent it, be assured, will European

powers witness the result. Our position is grand—let us not forget it is isolated. There are many reasons why we should have a navy, and why we should exert all our energies to procure one. It is difficult to believe, with the resources at command, the government could have had no vessels to raise the blockade had it been alive to its importance. And if the blockade were raised, such vessels would be important to protect our coasts—for the end of the blockade will not, of necessity, be the end of the war. A sound currency I believe now is almost vital to a good government; and a good government is the greatest of earthly blessings. The men of '76 triumphed over all difficulties; but we are not the men of '76, and this is a greatly different period. Treasury notes, receivable as they are in government dues, will answer for a while; but there is one condition which anything that answers the purpose of a sound currency must fulfil—it must be convertible into coin. Expedients have been resorted to in order to avoid this condition, and they have been many—yet all have failed.

I understand Mr. Calhoun's position in regard to treasury notes—they did better and were cheaper than loans negotiated through banks and capitalists, giving them the profits; and I understand his position in his speech in '34, on Mr. Webster's proposition to recharter the United States bank, and again in '37, upon banks. His views confirm what I say; and as we can get the specie only in exchange for our productions, it is of vital importance that we look for and get a navy at least to insure us an outlet for our productions. It is too late for an embargo policy—it could only have tested the strength of our staples, which the sham blockade has more effectually done and been found wanting, as a guaranty of our safety and independence. I believe, if called upon, the resources of our people and their patriotism are equal to the demand. The credit of our government will be tried severely, to supply its necessities even; but if one half we hear of the venality and corruption, speculation and peculation of government officers at Richmond be true, and such contracts are made as we understand, at Chattanooga, where the government, after giving 11½ cents gross for pork give the offal to the packers, and require only 40 lbs. of bacon for every 100 of pork, we may be assured the government credit will be tried to its utmost tension. Millions go to contractors for nothing. And nothing will so soon open a prospect of peace and rid us of a standing army as a navy; and, being old fashioned, I believe, with our ancestors, the men of '76, that standing armies are hostile to liberty. Sometimes they do not allow people to control their own actions. But it will be said, all admit that a navy is desirable; but how to get one? I admit the difficulty. But no one knows what he can accomplish until he tries. The object is worth the effort, and if others saw it in the light I do, all who could contribute one

dollar would do so, if needed, for an honest and an earnest effort to that end. As I understand, the point in dispute between the United States and the Confederate States is not whether cotton shall be sent abroad, but whether sent through United States or Confederate States ports.

The United States have made foreign powers believe that cotton would be furnished them whenever they could open a cotton port. Now, if such be the case, why not sell and get vessels for the produce loan: for the subscribers, I conclude, would not object, and let it go through any port, for the loan is useless as matters now stand. Would the United States prevent the subjects of France and England from shipping cotton through Northern ports? We buy and the United States buy arms in Europe, that is certain. If the foreign powers desired the blockade raised and desired to avoid a war with the United States by raising it, would they not be glad to give us a chance to raise it ourselves. If they recognized us, surely this could be done. But do we believe the United States would go to war with foreign powers for raising the sham blockade? Not after the obsequious conduct on the part of the United States so recently exhibited. No; if war occurs, it will be England, not the United States, that makes it. May not other powers be, in like condition with the United States, forced to make war abroad to keep peace at home. But if we are driven to our own resources, are we in this more inferior to the United States now than the United States were to Great Britain in 1812? I think not; and if so, we can establish a navy. Where there is a will, there is a way. If we never begin, we shall never accomplish the undertaking; therefore, the sooner begun the better. The dread of the transfer of trade and commerce to the Confederate States, if a recognized people, with an unfettered commerce, in a few years, I believe has much more to do in continuing the sham blockade than is supposed. And if, indeed, the juncture of affairs we live in has been truly indicated, and the South, in virtue of her production, is the great impelling cause of demands upon governments for concessions to the people, we should labor for a navy in season and out of season, and labor with all our might for such vessels as will enable us, if not done sooner by others, to raise the blockade ourselves; and if the war continue, to protect our coast, and then to have vessels to protect our flag wherever it floats on the high seas. Then, and not till then, may we consider ourselves safe and independent. Especially should we engage in no undertaking which must necessarily cause the expenditure of immense sums, and which, if successful, will probably almost certainly result disastrously, if not occasion the overthrow and loss of liberty. And this brings me to the next question—Shall we assume in war the aggressive policy? Those in favor of aggression must take leave of the *volunteer*

system. It must be so. Jackson himself, in a war purely defensive, experienced difficulties as to expiration of the enlistment periods of his men. In the enemy's country we must have men *for the war*. The necessity of this, if doubts were entertained, was made manifest during the Mexican war. And because I see this, and think I see fatal consequences beyond, I am unalterably opposed to a war of invasion.

Men, honest and patriotic, differ. Let us remember, too, the enemy has every position he had at the start, except Sumter, and many others which he then had not, and some of them on the seaboard, which we cannot defend for want of a navy; and, I ask, is not *that* the arm to be strengthened, and should we not expend on that the cost of campaigns in the enemy's country? But, while I am for the defensive policy, I am not for the *do-nothing* policy. I am for the policy that meets danger on the frontier. If I mean to defend my house, I shall try to meet the enemy at the threshold, and not allow him to enter and punish those who are true, and incite to treason those who are false. If the enemy invades my soil I'd find him, and when I found him I'd fight him. I would not keep an army, all eager for the fray, looking upon a land I felt bound to redeem from oppression, and for months to see her cities beleaguered, her land devastated, her men disfranchised and imprisoned, and her women outraged, and yet do nothing. Especially when her sons had fought under my banners, and when where they fought there the enemy's dead were piled the highest. If I could not extend to Maryland, Kentucky and Missouri protection for their loyalty, it should not be said the failure of protection resulted from supineness and inaction. If I had troops to defend a state, they should understand they were not *defending the state* by simply *defending themselves*. And when I won victories, they should not be barren and fruitless in results. If forced to retreat before the enemy upon my own soil, I would, if I could, leave it as a waste, howling wilderness rather than he should find a comfortable residence there or the means of subsistence. If I found prominent men within my country giving to the enemy aid and comfort, I would not trust to reform them by gentleness. I would Bastile or hang them, so that the ignorant and innocent—innocent because of their ignorance—should not be subject to penalties for crimes which their abettors lacked only the courage to perpetrate. I would attack on the frontiers of the enemy any point, if I could, and demolish it where he sought to concentrate troops to annoy or to invade and lay waste my country. And all this is strictly defensive. And, therefore, as for the purpose last named Washington city was used, I cannot see why it was not attacked and its public buildings demolished after the battle of Manassas. It is said the want of the means of transportation prevented. But this seems strange: for we know that Jackson, the volunteer

general, with six or twelve months men, marched through a wilderness country, cut his road and built his bridges, whipped the Indians as he went, and at New Orleans achieved a victory over troops not Yankees, but troops renowned the world over for their valor. And when we look at the result, may we not doubt if the defect be so much in the system as in *the leaders*. Again; it is said we could not afford to lose the men we should have lost in the attack. Have we not since lost more from disease? It is also said the value of the public buildings was too large an item for settlement on the return of peace. DESTRUCTION is the business of war. If we have to compensate for all we destroy, why sanction privateering? Who can restore our fallen heroes to life? Who can compensate for the crimes and cruelties perpetrated upon our innocent people? But why this solicitude about the public buildings? Why undertake to get possession of Arlington and Georgetown heights—the defences of Washington—unless to force McClellan to a field fight, satisfied we could whip him or force him to capitulate, and thus get possession of the city, and save the public buildings? Was the solicitude in preserving the public buildings for the purpose of removing there the seat of government, as it was from Montgomery to Richmond, because Maryland would be the scene of operations, and thus have our president elect inaugurated upon the very steps of the Washington capitol? The idea is fascinating, if not romantic. But, while it might flatter the ambition of a Cæsar, it would be no temptation to one possessed of the lineaments of the Father of his country. Are we to read in this solicitude about the public buildings, *reconstruction*? Would not their destruction have proclaimed, far and near, deep and wide, SEPARATION now and forever? Without reconstruction, I ask, what would they be worth to either side? If we could have taken it—and of this there seems no doubt—and could not have held it, by destroying them the abolition government would no longer be known as the government of Washington, a name they disgrace. When those who defiled and polluted the Temple at Jerusalem were whipped and scourged and driven away, although by our Saviour, those who afterward entered continued to defile and pollute it, and it was demolished, leaving not one stone upon another; so should have been demolished the Washington capitol. We might then have breathed freer and breathed deeper. But the aggressive policy, why adopt it? To conquer a peace! It is one thing to say it, another to do it—but how to do it so as to preserve liberty, is the great question. Many, burning under a sense of wrong, are ready for anything that can make the enemy feel the hand of the oppressor, the sting of the invader. They would lay waste and destroy. If, however, the war is to be one of mutual destruction, it will be endless. But I take it its advocates are for conquering a peace; and let us recollect a wise remark:

"men can put things in motion, but cannot always control them." If successful, we must, after we get into the enemy's country, buy our supplies, for we could not carry them; and if we did, it would cost us as much as to buy them. I say, we should have to get supplies in one way or the other. If we undertake to quarter upon the enemy, to take subsistence without pay, it would be as with the French in the Peninsular war. As the army could not go for provisions, foraging parties would; and would they return? It is admitted, the finest army ever marshaled in the heart of a hostile country would fade away like snow before the sunshine under the partisan and guerilla system. If we bought from the enemy or furnished our own supplies, the expense would bankrupt our treasury, and our people, too, if long persisted in. If, for the want of transportation, our army could not move from Manassas to Washington, what will the necessary transportation not cost to go into the heart of the enemy's country?

If successful, it might result in reconstruction or conquest. If reconstruction followed even by the adoption of the Confederate constitution, it has no guaranties for rights and liberties not in the United States constitution, and the result would be the victors would become the vanquished, as in the Mexican conquest, and we would not be allowed to occupy the country we now hold only as the equals of slaves, and slaves where we were equals. If it result in conquest, what shall we do with the conquest? The whole country shrunk from the idea of governing Mexico as a conquered province. It would be to subvert the foundation of our government, founded as it is upon the consent of the governed. It would bring with it such a train of abuses and corruption that the government could not survive. I know those for aggression mean to conquer a peace, and think it would be easy because the Lincoln government is weak, and, therefore, easily overthrown. *There is the danger.* If overthrown, with whom would you make peace. Do you believe peace could be extorted from Lincoln? It would cost him and his cabinet, if not more, their heads. Do you believe you could strengthen a peace party, who would gain the ascendancy, and make peace? And if so, in how long a time? Not without upsetting the government before Lincoln's term expires. But do you believe you could find a party for that purpose who could get power under the imputation of sympathy with the enemy who had invaded their country, and were giving him aid and comfort? If so, low, indeed, are they sunk. Far lower than the Mexicans, degraded as we consider them, because Mr. Polk proposed the absurdity of establishing in Mexico a free government by a military despotism, and force them to live under it so that he might make a treaty of peace, for those in favor of it dared not to make the avowal. And if such party for us did succeed, would not that itself open the

door to reconstruction; if unsuccessful, could we desert our friends? This, then, is the state of the case. A war of invasion, if successful to accomplish the desired result, would bankrupt the treasury; and, if long-continued, also the people. And might, if successful, lead to far more disastrous consequences. And then it might be unsuccessful; and if so, all would say it had better not been undertaken. I invite those who favor this policy to review the events of the Mexican war, and to read the speeches of Mr. Calhoun on the 16th and 17th of March, 1848, and those of a kindred character. The history of this is recent, and, therefore, I invite attention to it, not because other histories of wars aggressive are uninteresting. I ask those who favor aggression, to answer if they do not know all this talk about conquering a peace from Mexico was not intended to disguise a desire for expansion, for conquest, conveyed under such slang as we could swallow the whole of Mexico? And can they consider that a safe precedent, where we so narrowly escaped the most fatal consequences? No, not escaped. The disruption of the government foretold as likely to follow has actually occurred, and we have yet to solve the question whether the other fear entertained by Mr. Calhoun, not only the last but the noblest Roman of them all, shall be realized—the loss of liberty. After reviewing these events, not by the brilliant light of splendid victories, but in the sober light of reason and truth, say, ought a people to sanction a policy merely for the idea of conquering a peace, with whom *liberty is all in all, and with whom the one great object is to conquer a peace so as to preserve liberty, without which peace would not be worth its conquest?* If peace be the leading, the paramount object with the people of the Confederacy, they can get it to-morrow, although by Lincoln's proclamation the time is up for peaceable submission, and, perhaps, they might adopt the Confederate constitution for the sake of peace on the other side; but if we have honesty, or truth, or self-respect left us, war in comparison would be, indeed, a blessing. For years past, the states North and South have been in a *quasi* state of war, because that people would not or could not respond to the obligations of a constitutional form of government adopted by our ancestors. If the spirit of liberty still lives among them, they will come to a sense of their obligations, from the fact of the separation show a sense of their material interests; if not, it will require a government that rules by force, which, if they can establish and avert anarchy—for after anarchy and revolution it will be established—and that government to preserve itself will enforce its obligations upon its people, and show a proper regard for its material interests, and then the obligations of a peace by them would be respected. Of course, the sooner such a result can take place the better for them and for us. I have thought, from the time the announcement was made in Montgomery, the ag-

gressive policy would, if possible, be adopted. Whether the do-nothing policy has been followed for the purpose of disgusting one with the true defensive policy, I cannot say. The announcement was, before long the Confederate flag should float, mind you, not over the ruins, but from the dome of the Washington capitol, and if that did not satisfy the abolition government it would be carried still farther north. If I thought so, I would say it; but I do not believe the president, or any of our leaders, desires to strike liberty. Yet so said Anthony of Cæsar. Cæsar did not murder liberty, but from necessity—a conviction honestly entertained by many—and whether real or supposed, upon its ruin he established a military despotism. The practical question with us is not whether was Brutus justified in slaying Cæsar, but whether he and the true men should have permitted the policy of aggressive wars, and other measures leading to such a necessity, as it certainly is ours now to labor in season and out of season to avert a catastrophe which, if averted, will render unnecessary the repetition of the plea which justified Cæsar, and the tragedy enacted by Brutus. The elder Brutus, more fortunate, not more worthy, not truer, struck down the tyrant to *achieve* liberty and triumphed, while the younger struck down the tyrant to *preserve* liberty; but, alas, *too late!* Let it never be forgotten, it is one thing to achieve liberty, but ours is the far more difficult one—its preservation. I will say, however, what I do believe: if an aggressive policy be adopted, and the measures advocated during the Mexican war by our president be carried out, and he exercise the powers himself as president which he claimed for Mr. Polk, nothing could be more fatal to liberty—and so will any unprejudiced mind believe. The concomitants of a successful war of invasion are victories, conquest, a love of power, a love of dominion; of a defensive war, are devotion to homes and firesides, a love of country, a love of liberty.

ART. V.—MOTLEY'S HISTORY OF THE UNITED NETHERLANDS.*

In a previous paper—"The Rise of the Dutch Republic"—it was regretted that the author had stopped at the wrong point. We have to express the same regret in the work before us, which concludes with the year 1590, though the author promises to bring it, in two additional volumes, down to the year 1618, at which time was convened the Synod of Dort; after which it is his wish, at a future day, to write the history of that

* History of the United Netherlands, from the death of William the Silent to the Synod of Dort. By John Lathrop Motley, LL.D., D.C.L. 2 vols. Harper & Brothers, New York. 1861.

eventful period, the history of the thirty years war, which broke out in Germany, and was finally brought to a close by the great treaty of Westphalia, in 1647, whereby the rights of the United Provinces were secured, as it was supposed and designed to be, in the simplest and firmest manner. We not only regret the dividing points the author has again selected; but, notwithstanding the minute and voluminous work which is promised, it will, after all, be left unfinished, as respects the history of the united provinces, subsequent to the treaty of Westphalia. We agree that this treaty established a turning point in the history of a large portion of Southern Europe, when the conflict of arms between Spain and the low countries was hushed, and free and commercial intercourse prevailed between those nations whose previous history for more than three quarters of a century had been one constant flow of blood—one unsuspended clash of arms; but it will occur to the historic student that many pages of yet unarraigned history ought to be collected and written, about the progress and the destiny of the once united seven provinces since the treaty of Westphalia; hence the reading public will regret that Motley's great work will, after all, be but a huge and unfinished fragment of that part of European history, the most important in fixing the fate of modern empires, and stamping the character of society, morally, socially, intellectually and politically, which has ever occurred in modern times; but that it will leave a desideratum, which, from the specimens we have of Motley as a historian, we think he alone, of the great living authors, either in England or America, could best supply.

It is no part of a just criticism to find unnecessary fault with an author, or inconsistent with its several demands to present the fullest praise when merited. In a former paper, we have acknowledged the high claims Motley has presented as a historian. In the first work he published, "The Rise of the Dutch Republic," the style and method were eminently adapted to the subject—being one replete with stirring events, and bold and chivalrous character; consequently, a fair opportunity was presented for the display of that brilliant descriptive writing which abounds in the first work, and gave it a most deserved popularity.

In the work now before us, there is an occasional indulgence of the same talent, especially in the description of the second siege of Antwerp—the heroic defence, the awful suffering, the minute description of scene and event, with the presentation of person and character, are all grouped and connected with a master's hand. But as a general subject for rhetorical display, the author had not the same wild, exciting and romantic field in the history of the United Netherlands as in "The Rise of the Dutch Republic," though war, bloody and unrelenting, darkens the whole scene.

Here, he had to address himself to a more serious and laborious historical labor, with all the intricate mazes of that complicity which belongs to the history of a nation standing on the slippery slopes of governmental inauguration, before its independence *de facto* was established, and surrounded with all the intricacies of diplomacy, which especially beclouded international communication and intercourse in the days of Philip II, Queen Elizabeth and the Henries of France. In the history of the United Netherlands—and we have but two volumes, of 532 and 563 pages, confined to the brief period of six years, from 1584 to 1590—the author has discarded in a great measure that captivating and thrilling descriptive writing which we have noticed in his Dutch Republic, and become a most laborious and, in some instances, a painfully tedious chronicler of unimportant transactions, which serve rather to encumber the page and weary the reader than to illustrate, to adorn, or to dignify grave and philosophic history. For example, refer to the many pages occupied in the whimsical quarrel between Elizabeth and the friends of Leicester, after he assumed the office of Governor of the Netherlands—all of which deserved but a brief notice, as it all amounted to nothing, for the queen subsided into a good humor after a while, and loved the earl as much as ever. Then, again, more time is taken up to prove that Queen Elizabeth was parsimonious even to meanness, which no one even doubted, than if the famous woman had been indicted and tried for some grave offence. Then, again, a quarrel occurs in a drunken frolic at Hollock's apartment at the Hague; Hollock strikes Norris with the cover to a silver vase, and every word uttered during this drunken frolic is copied *verbatim* into a grave history. These may be in themselves small evils; but when repeated too often, it becomes a serious fault in the historian. Our author excuses himself for occupying so much space on so short a period, by the significance of events, and their results for future ages, embraced between the years 1584 and 1590. The events of this period were in themselves of no greater significance than those which transpired after 1590 down to 1647; for, after 1590, among other important events, were the comparative demolition of the Spanish empire, the sacking of Corunna, and the threatened seizure of Lisbon by the English; the death of Philip II, in 1598; the advancement to the Spanish throne of his son, Philip III, who, being too stupid for a monarch, gave himself up entirely to the direction of the duke, Serma, who, without talent, had prudence and moderation, as was indicated by the early ratification of peace with France, and the abandonment of the insane idea of Philip II, of constantly fanning the flame of civil war in France, between the rival houses of Navarre and Valois; and, also, the peace with England, which brought about a truce with the low countries, which, after continuing for

twelve years, resulted in the acknowledgement of the independence of the Netherlands; and the death of Elizabeth, in 1603, may be considered as important events, occurring between 1590 and 1618, as any that occurred between 1584 and 1590, for within the latter period the most significant events were the alliance of the Netherlands with England, and the organization of what the author styles the "Dutch commonwealth" in 1588.

Motley is, unquestionably, an eminent historian; he has industry, which prompts him to labor; he has acquired extensive attainments in the various paths of literature; appears to gather every fact, and to consult every source from which knowledge can be obtained in reference to the subjects on which he writes; he has a clear and distinct style, which, at times, is beautiful and tinged with some of the purest rhetoric; his arrangement is methodical, and he pursues the narrative with fidelity; yet, he appears to lack some qualifications inseparable from the most eminent historians; he may state facts accurately, but he dogmatizes too much, and scarcely ever rises to the true dignity of the philosophy of history; he narrates incessantly, except when he falls into description of scene or person, and, when the narrative ends, he glides with great regularity into succeeding narrative; but in vain will the reader look for the high moral principle, the deep and serene deductions of philosophy, which spring from and entwine themselves around the mighty actions of conflicting nations, after the storms of revolutions have passed away.

He is not unmindful of great events, of decisive action in nations and individuals, yet he passes on with the historic current, gathers up everything with the minuteness of a reporter, whether a trivial conversation or the sanction of an important treaty; whether the siege of a commercial city or the cutting of an officer's face with a piece of a silver vase, and relates them all with the same indefatigable minuteness. Another defect is patent upon the page of Motley: he looks too exclusively to the military portion of history; and in describing battles, manœuvres and sieges, he is not even excelled by Napier, but he neglects the civil and literary parts of history; it is true he follows up the dark and hidden paths of diplomacy with skill and subtilty, and enters with alacrity into party politics and personal intrigues, but great questions of constitutional and national law, great questions of jurisprudence, their decisions, their influence upon civil and diplomatic history, are but slightly touched, if not ignored.

In his delineations we have no doubt he is truthful in the statement of facts, but he is an ardent admirer, or bitter hater; in his sketches of prominent characters, a department of literary composition in which he excels, he would be matchless did he not allow his feelings to get the upper-hand of him, by

which he makes them either the very best or meanest of characters. This enthusiasm will adorn the page of a writer with many gems, but the impartial historian should paint every feature with accuracy—the best and most brilliant characters are not perfect, the meanest of mankind may not have every feature of mind and morals blackened and distorted; in other words, we would have Motley more analytic in his personal description, but we are far from thinking that he designs the slightest injustice, for we do him the honor to say he writes like an honest and honorable man, as no doubt he is; liberal, just, generous, but ardent and impetuous; quick to conceive and strong in his feelings, wherever moral worth is found or deflection from a high and pure standard of morality is involved.

The first important topic which we notice in the work before us, is the condition of the Netherlands after the death of William the Silent, who was emphatically the guiding star of the nation; but whatever might have been the destiny of this people, it is not admitted, according to the caption of chapter 1, part vi, 3 vol. Dutch Republic, that “a republic was born” or a nation was severed. If we look to the pages of Motley’s Netherlands, there is ample proof that the Netherlands were neither *de facto* or *de jure* independent; and, at a future time, we may institute the inquiry, how far the Dutch Republic was constitutionally a republic.”

At the time of the death of William the Silent, it was not a republic, nor is it made to appear at the commencement of Motley’s History of the Netherlands, nor did it become such in its administrative capacity, or the true practical sense of the word, as far as his history has yet extended. We do not mean to dispute with the author about terms, but it is evident the Netherlanders were not only in terms far from either understanding the phrase or enjoying the state, not only of *sovereignty* but of a *republic*, when time after time; mission after mission, application after application was made to Queen Elizabeth to accept the sovereignty of the country, territory and people all included. The same application had been made to France, had been urged upon France, but her domestic troubles were such that it was refused. The great patriots and statesmen of the Netherlands were nearly unanimous, not only for the English alliance after the refusal of France, but sought that close connection with England which would transfer the *sovereignty* of the country to Queen Elizabeth. This the queen positively and unequivocally refused. Then a proposition was made for a defensive alliance. The queen, though urged by repeated applications from the Netherlands and importuned by Walsingham, Leicester, and others high in influence at the court, to accede to the request of the Netherlands, and grant them assistance, debated with herself long and anxiously; and, though it was to her interest, and ultimately proved the most

advantageous alliance perhaps ever made by England, our author does not appear to enter sufficiently into the feelings of Elizabeth in her long hesitancy. Let it be remembered that, at that time, the annual revenue of England was not more than five hundred thousand pounds, nor her population more than four millions; Ireland and Scotland held by the frailest tenure, both ready for revolt; and Philip, the wealthiest and most powerful monarch in Europe, threatening the extinction of the English empire, and the reader will see the awful consequences that menaced the queen.

A war with Philip was inevitable. He had sworn vengeance against Protestantism the world over, and if Elizabeth undertook the cause of the Netherlands, she undertook the cause of Protestantism; and upon the settlement of the international affairs of France, she, too, might be arrayed against England and the Netherlands, as the sole defenders of the Protestant religion. History must do Elizabeth, then, this justice, too long denied, that in entering into alliance with the Dutch, no sovereign ever faced a more dreadful threatening, or displayed more unalloyed heroism. But the step was taken, never to be retraced, and the consequences have left a lasting and ineffable glory upon England, and a benefit upon mankind, as brilliant and as extensive as the Protestant religion. Wherever man is free, and in quiet enjoyment of the eternal principles of liberty, wherever tyranny, bigotry and persecution has been hushed and forever buried, wherever the Bible is read and God worshipped in that freedom and purity of conscience which springs from an uncorrupted religion, there will its votary cherish the recollections of that contest which drove Philip from the Netherlands, and planted the true seeds of liberty amidst the dykes and lagoons of Holland and the United Provinces. England herself reaped immeasurable advantages therefrom. Elizabeth, though Protestant, was bigoted and intolerant; and it was from the political school of William the Silent that English statesmen learned political and religious toleration. It was from the United Provinces that England caught, by happy contact, the principles that inaugurated the revolution of 1688; banished forever the cruel and relentless Stuart from the English government, and finally achieved a bloodless revolution, which placed a Hanoverian line in permanent and prosperous reign upon the English throne.

But, to return to the history before us. After Elizabeth had promised and sent substantial aid and comfort to the Dutch, she exhibited much parsimony, and even meanness, in withholding supplies. Never was greater suffering, greater endurance, than was exhibited by the English and Dutch soldiery; but, unclad, almost starving, the poor soldiers and officers stood to their duty. Had the queen exhibited any administrative capacity, she could have ended this contest years sooner; but

her ineffable stinginess worked a long delay, a heavier expenditure, and vastly increased suffering. For the purpose of effecting the proposed end of the alliance, the queen, under the importunities of the Dutch commissioners, sent a person of quality to reside among them, and the Earl of Leicester was selected. Since the queen had refused to accept the sovereignty, what was the pressing necessity for this last request of the states? Let our author answer: "*The sovereignty*, which had been held by the estates, ready to be *conferred* respectively upon Anjou and Orange, remained in the hands of the *estates*. There was no opposition to this theory" (p. 11, vol. i). We will show that there was, however, decided opposition to it. At another place, he says: "Since the death of William the Silent, there was no one individual in the Netherlands to impersonate the great struggle of the provinces with Spain and Rome, and to concentrate upon his own head a practical, dramatic, and yet most legitimate interest" (p. 314, vol. i). This is rather a vague and indefinite exposition of sovereign power, which we find expressed in more statesmanlike terms, by Joos de Menin, pensionary of Dort, and one of the envoys to England, who, in the name of his associates, delivered an address to the queen, in which he said: "Since the death of the Prince of Orange, the states have lost many important cities, and now, for the preservation of their existence, they have need of a prince and sovereign lord to defend them against the tyranny and iniquitous oppression of the Spaniards and their adherents, who are more and more determined utterly to destroy their country" (vol. i, p. 318).

Again: Leicester is sent to the Netherlands, with the limited military authority of commander-in-chief over four thousand English soldiers. The Netherland envoys in England, in their parting advice, most distinctly urged him "to hold authority with the first, to declare himself chief-head and governor-general" of the whole country. The sequel not only proves the secret purposes of the earl, but the feeling and sentiments of the estates. The offer of governor-general was pressed upon him—an office involving the highest civil and military powers. The earl hesitated, only because he knew the wrath of the queen would be kindled at his treachery, his duplicity, and the assumption of powers incompatible with her own dignity, as well as transcending the range of his mission. It was forbidden fruit, but he yielded to the tempter. His own wicked heart urged him forward; he clutched the bait, and was inaugurated governor-general of the united provinces of Guelderland, Zutphen, Flanders, Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Friesland, and all others in confederacy with them. It has been said that it was the highest civil and military office known to the confederacy; and, indeed, was it an alarming growth of power. He was to have supreme military command by land and sea. He was to

exercise supreme authority in matters civil and political, according to the customs prevalent in the reign of the Emperor Charles V. All officers, civil and military, were to be appointed by him, and the states general were to assemble whenever and wherever he should summon them. The reader can readily draw the conclusion, from the above facts, that the provinces had no correct idea of popular sovereignty; and, as will be subsequently shown, but a feeble sense of true republican liberty at this time, notwithstanding the constant recurrence of the word *republic*, not only in Motley, but even Macaulay, whenever he writes of the character of the Netherland government.

We are highly pleased with the clear and decided picturing of the character of Leicester; but the author has almost, if not entirely, overlooked the most prominent feature in the life of this house-plant of royal favor, that withered beneath the frown of the inconstant and variable queen, or shrank from the colder blast of the popular breath; which prominent feature was indicated by the radical change he attempted to introduce into the political and constitutional organization of the government of the Netherlands, by receiving the appointment to the high and unwarrantable authority of governor-general by the representatives of the states, who, though they transcended every license, yet introduced the anomalous instance of popularizing it among the provinces, in the very face of the organic principles of the revolution. We think it also apparent, that the author, whether deficient or not in that power of analysis inseparable from a great and masterly historian, has failed to exhibit the difference in the principles which existed in the body politic of England and the Netherlands, as well as in their respective governments, which *per se*, wide apart and repellant, were only united under a pressing and absolute necessity of self-preservation. Elizabeth was Protestant, and so were a vast majority of the people; but the crown and the popular sentiment were intolerant—the very antipodical doctrine and sentiment of the Netherlands, who, imbibing the principles which constituted the corner-stone of the Orange party, proclaimed toleration as the guiding star of liberty. The English were as free at home as they then desired, and Queen Elizabeth had no feeling in common with the struggling Netherlanders on that score. She hesitated long before joining them, and her intrigues with Philip II to procure a peace were based upon the true apprehension that he designed the total overthrow of her kingdom, whether she made common cause or not with the low countries. With the perception and under the conviction of this truth, urged by the calm and clear foresight of Walsingham, which was realized by the equipment of the falsely styled “invincible armada,” she then directed the energies of her mind and the strength of her kingdom to the relief of the Netherlands. She was compelled to blend the maintenance of

the Protestant religion and the liberties of the provinces with the preservation of her kingdom, because Philip, in designing to extinguish that religion on earth, determined to use Catholicism as the most powerful incentive to the prostration of the English crown; and it was thus, indirectly, that the Protestant cause became the rallying cry of resistance to Philip, who, had he not used Catholicism as a great political engine by which he was to work his way to universal dominion, would never have encountered the dread trident that for the first time in Europe proved that England was mistress of the seas. It is not that we object to the position of the author, that the great contest was that of the Catholic religion against the Protestants, after the war was fully inaugurated, but that in common with other writers he appears to fall into the prevalent error that it was the great issue of that period. We agree it became the most important question that then agitated, or ever did or could agitate the world; but it became so secondarily. Elizabeth would never have strained her every nerve in its support, had not Philip determined to make war on her own kingdom; and the early dread of this forced her to an alliance with the Netherlands, obviously against her inclinations. We are not to be understood as depreciating or underrating the Protestant cause, which was the very ark of God; and, though buffeted by many an angry and fiery wave of revolution, contained in security the priceless pearl which alone can decorate in its purest splendor the fadeless crown of liberty, whether it decks a monarch's brow or glistens along the pathway of republican freedom. But, we are constrained to say that Motley, as a philosophic historian, devoted as he should have been to the tracing of cause and effect, intent upon the analysis of great principles, with rich material around him, has failed to present the manner in which this contest developed itself into the great cause of a true Christian religion—the spirit in which a wicked and godless queen was forced from political circumstances to lend the material and intellectual powers of her kingdom to prevent the church of God from sinking again beneath the dark, the tempestuous and the dreadful billows of superstition, persecution and tyranny; and, in failing to do this, he has not presented a true history of the political and social exigency and purpose of the English government, or the primary motives of the woman whose strong though capricious will guided its machinery.

In reading the pages of Motley, it will also be observed that he has omitted to treat, as it demanded at his hands, the very important influence of the sudden disrobing of the earl of his supreme authority, and his unceremonious departure from the shores of Holland.

It is true he busies himself with a careful report of a dispute between Wilkes, the advocate of the Leicestrian school, who

held the doctrine of the sovereignty of the governor, who, it was contended with but little wisdom, derived his power from sovereign states, which he was afraid and unable to rule. The great and rugged Barneveldt, who with threatening voice and majestic lion port dissolved the metaphysical web of Wilkes, yet in defending the sovereignty of the states or the government, he seemed, in connection with Franck and others, to have destroyed the doctrine of popular sovereignty; and herein consist the defect of the very school which would make the Netherlands free—here were planted the evil seeds of the policy of the Leicestrian party, which forced their opponents, in the endeavor to break down the false position of the sovereignty of the governor-general, to assume the principles that located it in the states, and as effectually grasped it and wrenched it from the hands of the people, although it had been exercised by the the governor-general himself, for it was from the states, in formal assembly, that he obtained and claimed his authority. It was a destructive position into which the crafty earl had wound himself, and an equally destructive one by which his opponents would unwind the robe of power in which he enveloped his authority. There were some things good and true said by Barneveldt and other representatives of the states, especially in reference to the doctrine that the states respected the difference in religious opinions; leaving all churches in their freedom, they chose to leave man's conscience unfettered—this was the doctrine of toleration which was born and nurtured on the soil of the United Provinces, and grew to manhood and strength amidst the storms of the revolution, whose violence sent it deep into the heart of society, as the storms of the outer world drive deep into the soil of the earth the roots of the stubborn oak, while its green and spreading branches are pointing to the heavens. But, is it not perceptible that the doctrine of the opponents of Leicester, of the opponents of what they dreaded, a strong government, were falling into the artful meshes of the deep, dark intriguer, who, doubtless, saw with satanic grin that in giving sovereignty to the government they were robbing the same party upon whom he would himself depredate—the people; and thus these men, able statesmen, honest and upright as they were, dealt a severe blow to the cause which they would sacrifice property and life to sustain. And we will presently show the truth of this remark, by tracing the elevation of Morice to the stadtholdership to be attributed to the very principles started by the Leicestrian school, and, unfortunately unchecked by his adversaries, who looked upon the earl, as he was, the most dangerous man in the whole country.

At the period about which Motley has written, the entire fabric of society in Europe—social, moral and political—was shaken to its very centre. The little revolt, which started in the Netherlands, awoke and excited principles which involved

not only European thrones, but the happiness, the peace, the destiny of Christendom; but more closely affiliated with the revolt was the political philosophy of England, France and Spain. The events of the period present a full and rich subject for the speculations of the historian—replete with lessons of wisdom for national instruction. What warnings for the future statesmen is presented in the wild and cruel ambition of Philip, whose madness gathered around him those most furious storms which not only shattered his realm, but were the monitors of that national degradation and social corruption which has followed the Spanish government for nearly three centuries, as the just wages of a career of sin and turpitude. There was France, her nationality almost torn into tatters by intestine broils, between the contesting Henries, with the powerful array of Philip's minions and mercenaries ready, at a moment's notice, to invade her soil, subjugate her realm, and banish her from the family of nations. It is stern and truthful history that the impending absolute ruin of France was almost at the point of consummation, and, had Philip struck a blow while the rival houses of Guise and the Bernean had paralyzed every limb of the nation in the contest between Henry of Navarre and Henry of Valois, the extinction of France would have been at hand. There, too, in the very midst of the contest, sat anxious and trembling England, her fate resting upon the dancing wave that bore the Spanish fleet to her imperilled shores. But a little way off, the struggling, restless, brave, defiant, unconquerable United Provinces were bearing the brunt of that contest which saved Europe and upheld, amidst every shock, the cause of Protestantism and the purest altars of liberty. Here was a grand grouping of nations, a mighty confluence of events, which, in grandeur and importance, have scarcely ever been witnessed among men—the light of whose influence has radiated the earth, whose reflex is modern civilization. But, Motley has been too much occupied with court gossip and transient diplomatic talk to arrange in proper order and present in the graphic dignity they deserve, these grand materials for philosophic history. It is surprising he did not. The rise of the Dutch republic, and the subsequent history of the Netherlands, afford the true basis of such history. The English writers have failed to embrace its spirit; the French historians have passed it by with comparative indifference, while Spanish authors have had neither the disposition nor the ability to do it justice.

In sketches of personal character, as we have remarked, the author is eminently clear, and, generally, just and accurate; yet, it is impossible to agree with him in his estimate of the character and motives of Saint Aldegonde, of whom he thus writes, in allusion to the course pursued and sentiments expressed by Walsingham, Davidson and others, about the Eng-

lish courts, as to the propriety of his arrest and confinement: "This was, however, a result somewhat difficult to accomplish; for twenty years of noble service in the cause of liberty had not been utterly in vain, and there were many magnanimous spirits to sympathize with a great man struggling thus in the meshes of adversity." That Aldegonde was a man of vast and varied learning, united with eminent talent, all admit; but that he was a great man, a good man, or a wise statesman, it is hard to believe, after an examination of his character and policy, as portrayed even by the author himself, from whom we learn that he was a devout Protestant, as he verily appeared to be, and a devotee to liberty, as he pretended to be; yet his constant hatred of England not only forced him to oppose a union of the provinces with the only Protestant country in the world, and the only one which could aid the Protestant cause, but actually drove him to seek and urge an alliance with Catholic France, under the rule of a factious, intolerant, bigoted persecutor of Protestants. And when this proposition was rejected by France, he would sacrifice "twenty years of noble service in the cause of liberty," by his constant and pertinacious effort to restore the Protestant provinces to the dominion of Philip II, the vilest Catholic monarch, and the most unscrupulous slave to corrupt and heartless tyranny that ever cursed or degraded an European throne. It is said that Aldegonde must have been honest and sincere in his conduct, since he boldly demanded an investigation and a trial. It turned out that there was no evidence that could be procured, in England, in reference to the bribery of this man by Philip II, and the subject was dropped. The absence of evidence can never remove a moral conviction, and what stupidity would be chargeable to this, among the most talented men of his day, to suppose him, late in life, doing everything in his power calculated to defeat the most strenuous exertions of his earlier years, without some inducement. Motley ascribes it to his hatred to England; yet he considers him a patriot who, to seek his vengeance on a foreign country, would urge to the last every step that would ruin his own, and prostrate every principle he, apparently, held dear. The reader may feel no interest in the personal history of Aldegonde, and it is of but little importance; yet it is evident Motley has fallen into a strange bewilderment in reference to him, and we only notice it as a defect in his history calculated to mislead the incautious reader.

The account our author gives of the great Spanish armada, and the minute, the comprehensive, yet distinct delineations of the battles that ensued, with all the various mutations of a mighty sea fight, is not only one of the finest pieces of work in the entire history, but, as far as it goes, as far, perhaps, as it purports to go, is unsurpassed by any historic description of naval battles in English history we have ever met with; it is

plain and simple, yet it presents the whole in a bold and graphic character.

The defeat of the Spanish armada, which occurred in 1588, was the most important event of the contest between Philip II and England. It was decisive; the power of Philip was broken; and, though he bore the result with apparent indifference, his hopes as well as his strength were gone. The author seems to be but slightly impressed with its awful consequences—not only holding the fate of empires upon the winds and waters, but the freedom, the happiness, the religion of millions, in the very grasp of tyranny and destruction. In the language of Hallam, it was “in that memorable year, when the dark cloud gathered round our coasts, when Europe stood by in fearful suspense to behold what should be the result of that great cast in the game of human politics; what the craft of Rome, the power of Philip, the genius of Farnese, could achieve against the island queen, with her Drakes and Cecils—in that agony of the Protestant faith and English name.”

It was yet a contest in which mind and valor were to triumph over mere animal strength; science and skill over numerical force. It is true, there were mighty ships which stretched out in the shape of a crescent, the horns of which spanned the ocean at a distance of seven miles apart; but what were these huge floating castles, clumsy and unwieldy, bearing thirty thousand soldiers, to fight a naval battle under the command of colonels of cavalry and generals of brigades who knew nothing of a sea fight or the command of a vessel, in comparison with even the thirty vessels of England, which danced upon the waves, and pelted on all sides the unwieldy hulks and galleons of the armada, who, in vain, attempted to grapple with the agile and light-winged foe, who damaged their sails and gearing and played off unharmed and untouched. What permanent danger could overhang England, when in comparison with the golden duke, a captain-general of the land forces; with Valdez; with Oquendo, mere generals in name; with Leyva, captain-general of the light horse of Milan; the old sea-girt isle was to be defended on the waters by such men as Sir Francis Drake, the first English navigator of the globe, the terror of every Spanish coast in the old as well as the new world; with Hawkins, the rough veteran of many a daring voyage on the African and American seas, experienced in fighting by many a desperate battle upon the ocean; with Fro-bisher, one of the earliest explorers of the Arctic seas; and Lord Admiral Howard, who is described as “being of a wise and noble courage, skilful in sea matters, wary and provident, and of great esteem among the sailors, resolved to risk his sovereign’s anger, and to keep the ships afloat at his own charge rather than that England should run the peril of losing their protection.” It is a well vouched anecdote of the day, that on

the afternoon of the 19th of July, 1588, a match of bowls was being played at the bowling green, on the Hoe at Plymouth, in which Drake and some of the other distinguished sea kings were matched, when a small armed vessel was seen running before the wind into Plymouth harbor with all sails set. Her commander, named Fleming, master of a Scotch privateer, landed in haste and eagerly sought the place where the lord admiral was standing, and told the English officers that he had that morning seen the Spanish armada off the Cornish coast. The captains began to hurry down to the water, shouting for the ships' boats; but Drake coolly checked his companions, and insisted that the game should be played out, saying that there was sufficient time to win the game and then beat the Spaniards. The game was played out; they then went on board and prepared for action, soon to aim their guns calmly at the enemy, with hearts as light, and nerves as firm, as if still playing at the bowling green.

The two volumes of the history of the Netherlands close with the memorable events of 1588 and 1589, which not only witnessed the thorough defeat of the Spanish armada, and foretold the future wreck of the Spanish throne, but indicated, as the author justly remarks, that the great game of despotism against freedom would be transferred to the oft-distracted and turbulent soil of France. The condition of the political and military affairs of Europe assumed a new aspect, which, with the destruction of similar principles which had, in previous years, produced such volcanic effects, were destined not only to increase the fury of the populace, but the madness of the rulers. Elizabeth was involved in it, and furnished the new king of France with more money in gold than he had ever seen before in his life. Netherlands had provided him with as much more, while Willoughby, Roger Williams, Baskerville, Umpton and Vere, with 4,000 English pikemen, had already made a vigorous campaign in the cause of the Huguenots—the true and pious Protestants of France. We must, however, forbear a notice of these events, until favored with the future volumes of the author, who, we doubt not, will portray the mighty events which were to occur, with that methodic arrangement and brilliant style which has heretofore marked his writings.

The reader has also pictured to himself the rapid improvement of republican liberty in Holland, which would have had a fairer opportunity of developing itself, and perfecting a permanent political organization, while Parma, Philip and Mayenne were fighting the Bearnease for the crown of France. It was truly a period, when the shock of battles, and the conflict of every social and political element seemed to threaten the happiness and safety of man throughout Europe; and though Harry of Navarre stood firm and true to the Protestant cause, we turn with proud satisfaction to the position, the in-

fluence, the strength, of Elizabeth, whose kingdom was the great breakwater to the mighty tide of tyranny and Catholic usurpation that was rushing against the bulwarks of liberty: yet is the picture marred by the melancholy reflection, that the pernicious principles of the Leicestrian school, to which allusion has been made as still smouldering beneath a smothered fire, were to be again kindled; for, it must not be forgotten in this contest, that Prince Maurice, of whom more is to be said, after being made stadtholder, an unfortunate office, as it will appear, in the struggle of the Hollanders for liberty, the prince, becoming intoxicated with battles, sieges and victories, sought, in the delirium of an evil hour, another crown besides the laurels he had gathered. The title of the greatest general in Europe could not satisfy his ambition. He projected the destruction of the work accomplished by his father, the Prince of Orange, and tarnished the name and glory of a family devoted, by toil and suffering, to the cause of freedom, by raising a partial despotism on the bosom of liberty.

The most valuable and interesting portion of this historic field is yet to be surveyed by the author; and Maurice, the silent and studious boy, with less virtue than talent, under the misguided influence of his juvenile motto: *tandem fit surculus arbor*, had become a bold and active man, who did more by usurpation and tyranny to regard the principles of the republican party than had, in the first years of his career, been accomplished by his sword in repelling the enemies of his country; for, as he developed from the sapling to the oak, the full-grown tree drove its gnarled roots roughly and violently against every fibre of the scions of the young republic—an example, among many others, held up by the page of history to prove to freemen the danger of compromising with unjust principles of legislation, or creating in a republic an officer whose functions are not limited and defined by the plainest and firmest lines and boundaries.

We are anxious to examine the principles of civil liberty, as illustrated by the social and political organization of Holland, with its laws and constitution—those that were good and those that were productive of evil—to show from the practical manner in which the office of stadtholder was virtually transmitted, by hereditary lineage, to Frederick, the brother of Maurice, and upon the death of Frederick, to his only son, who was immediately invested with all the civil and military appointments exercised by his father; to show that there were inherent and congenital principles lurking in the body politic and clustering around the constitution, that preyed upon the vitals of liberty, which the people neither foresaw nor apprehended. But this would lead me to anticipate the author, and we prefer waiting until an opportunity is offered for an examination of the facts and views he may present in the promised two volumes yet to

be published, and bidding an adieu to Mr. Motley, we hope to meet him again on the pages of a friendly review, with the hope that he will present the reader with a minute and accurate narrative of the great events, and a spirited delineation of the great characters who will arise before him; but from what has been said above, the reader may not only anticipate some inability in the author to fulfil the requirements of a history of times so portentous and pregnant with the destiny of nations; and from his avowed radicalism, illy qualified to expound the grand and conservative philosophy upon which a good and wise government, of any form, can alone rest, and as equally disqualified to illustrate the nature and character of those destructive principles of society whose malarious breath has so often changed the principles of *republicanism* into a self-destructive *democracy*.

If circumstances shall delay access to Mr. Motley's promised continuation of the "Dutch History," we propose writing a paper upon the civil history of the United Provinces, subsequent to the time embraced in the work before us. It is the most interesting period of the Dutch history, the most instructive: nations learn more from civil history than from battles, revolutions open the door to national reform and progress, and we learn the philosophy of the social and political philosophy of a people when they are at peace.

If the author properly understands the history of Maurice, the despot, to whom he has already bestowed too much praise, he may use his information to the advantage of that government he now represents at a foreign court, and not only hold up, in advantageous light, the character of the man who, in becoming stadtholder in Holland, inflicted a stab upon constitutional liberty which should be a warning to the man who gave our author the lucrative post he now holds. But, if he fully appreciates the causes which combined to destroy the constitution of Holland, he may exhibit a lesson of practical wisdom to his deluded and demented fellow-citizens, who are destroying the constitutional liberty—we fear he does not appreciate or regard either as a patriot or a philosopher, as he shelters himself from the storm in the quiet alcoves of the luxurious libraries of the Prussian capital.

ART. VI.—DR. CARTWRIGHT REVIEWED—THE NEGRO, APE AND SERPENT.

Dr. Samuel A. Cartwright, of New Orleans, adopting Dr. Adam Clarke's conclusion that the creature which beguiled Eve was not a serpent, but walked erect, and was endowed with the gifts of reason and of speech, proceeds with arguments of his own, intended to prove that the creature was not of the

satyrus or simian kind, as Dr. Clarke supposed, but was a "negro-gardener." These arguments are next in order, but, to facilitate a proper appreciation of Dr. Cartwright's reliability for care and accuracy in scrutinizing premises, eliminating conclusions, and laying results before his readers, it may be well to notice some of the nonlogical fallacies into which he has been seduced by an over-eager desire to support a cherished theory.

Dr. Cartwright attempts to magnify the importance of Dr. Clarke's conclusion, both as to its sources and its extent. First, as to the sources: he would enhance its value by stating that—

"Dr. Adam Clarke, the learned commentator of the Bible, from deep reading in the Hebrew, Arabic and Coptic languages, was forced to the conclusion that the creature which beguiled Eve was an animal formed like man, walked erect, and had the gift of speech and reason."—*De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 130. August, 1860.*

Yet, from the beginning to the end of his voluminous commentary, Dr. Clarke does not bring to the support of that conclusion a single argument deduced from the Hebrew, the Arabic, the Coptic, or from any other language. He argues from the facts recorded by Moses, not from the words in which they are recorded. The *nachash* conversed with Eve: he concludes that it "was endued with the gift of speech." It reasoned and disputed with Eve: he concludes that it "was endued with the gift of reason." It was condemned to crawl: he concludes that it had previously "walked erect." All the premises are patent on the face of every *English* version of the Bible, and Dr. Clarke might have reasoned exactly as he did, without knowing a word beyond his mother tongue. He has, indeed, brought arguments from the Hebrew and Arabic, but they are adduced in support of two other entirely distinct conclusions, namely: first, that he was at liberty to seek some other word than "serpent" to convey the true sense of the Hebrew word *nachash*, which he proves by showing that that word had a great variety of meanings; secondly, not that the creature walked, spoke or reasoned, but that it was "of the ape or satyrus kind." However well read he may have been in the Coptic, a very careful scrutiny has failed to discover an instance in which that language is ever so remotely alluded to in connection with any branch of the subject under consideration.

Dr. Clarke reached the conclusion that the *nachash* was "of the ape or satyrus kind," by divers arguments, one of which is derived in part from the Hebrew, and one from the Arabic. The Hebrew premise is, that "the most general meaning" of *nachash*, in the Bible, is "to view attentively," etc. This he combines with the affirmation that for "earnest, attentive watching, looking," etc., the satyrus kind "have no fellows in

the animal world." Had this been worth a reply, it might have been shown that, in this respect, the *serpent* equals or surpasses the *satyrus* kind, and have even become proverbial; for which reason Dr. Cartwright selected it as an illustration when he says that, among other things, *nachash* represents the abstract idea "of viewing attentively, as a snake views a bird."* The Arabic argument has been already noticed. Dr. Clarke brings from that language some words, between which and the Hebrew *nachash* he discovers no resemblance in sense, and not enough in sound to entitle it to a place in Dean Swift's philological *jeu d'esprit*, in which he derives "*Alexander the Great*" from "*all eggs under the grate*." If Dr. Cartwright had really given the Hebrew and Arabic arguments that weight which he seems to solicit from his readers, he would not have attempted to supplant the ape by the negro; for those arguments do not lead to the conclusion of which he claims the benefit—do not tend to determine abstractly what were the form and faculties of the *nachash*—but to identify that creature with the *satyrus* or ape kind, and thus exclude at once the serpent and the negro. The Hebrew argument, as just explained, shows that the word *nachash* expresses a trait for which the ape is remarkable; while the Arabic argument is founded on the similarity and common origin of the names of the devil and the ape. Dr. Cartwright's theory can derive no support from this, since negroes are neither devils nor apes; though, in denouncing each other, one of their most approved phrases is, "You black devil, you!"

Secondly. Dr. Cartwright, by implication, stretches Dr. Clarke's conclusion far beyond its real extent, when he says:

"Dr. Clarke thought that orang-outang would have been a better choice than serpent, for the name of a black creature, formed like a man, with the gift of speech and reason, a great deal of cunning, yet playful and good-natured, walking erect, a sorcerer and a slave to something that charmed it."—*De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, pp. 133, 134. August, 1860.*

This is by no means a faithful representation of Dr. Clarke's idea of the *nachash*; but only a very highly embellished filling up of his outline. The only lineaments borrowed from Dr. Clarke, are in the words: "with the gift of speech and reason, and walking erect;" to which Dr. Cartwright's finishing touch has added: "a black creature, formed like a man, with a great deal of cunning, yet playful and good-natured, a sorcerer, and a slave to something that charmed it." The idea, sufficiently expressed in the words "walking erect," is duplicated by a kind of appoggiatura, in the words "formed like a man." Other similar grace notes may be found in Dr. Cartwright's article.

* *De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 514. October, 1860.*

Again, assuming that several human races were originally created, Dr. Cartwright says that—

“After Cain killed his brother, he went into the land of Nod, inhabited by some one or more of the inferior races, and took a wife.”—*Be Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 134. August, 1860.*

Now, there is no such thing in the Bible. Many swift witnesses against the divine authority of that book attempt to prove a contradiction by first quoting the creation of the father and mother of all living, and then flippantly saying, “Cain went into the land of Nod and took a wife.” But it is strange to find a deep philosopher and professed believer in the word of God, falling into such a gross error while engaged in grave researches after the truth revealed in that divine volume. Instead of “a wife,” Moses says “his wife;” instead of “took” he says “knew.” Let a parallel passage be placed side by side with this:

<p>“And Adam knew his wife; and she conceived and bare Cain.”—<i>Genesis iv, 1.</i></p>	<p>“And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived and bare Enoch.”—<i>Genesis iv, 17.</i></p>
---	---

Here precisely the same thing is said of Adam and of Cain. It will not be pretended that the meaning is, that Adam “took a wife;” for the history shows that he had already taken her; and, therefore, Adam knew his wife whom he had before he was driven out of Eden. Hence, though nothing is previously said of the wife of Cain, it must be inferred that he had a wife before he “went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden.”* Though Moses has recorded the leading events in chronological order, that order has not been rigidly observed with regard to minor events. Having told of the creation of all things, including men, both male and female, and of the seventh-day rest, he reverts to the creation of man, the planting of Eden, and the creation of the woman, whom God “brought unto the man,” blessing them with the words “be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.”† And Adam, before the fall, alludes to the future relation of parent and child.‡ It is certain, therefore, that Adam’s knowledge of his wife preceded their expulsion from Paradise; yet it is not mentioned till after the history of the temptation, the fall, and the expulsion. So, though the murder of Abel and the curse of Cain are narrated, and it is said that he went out and dwelt in the land of Nod before it is said that he knew his wife, it is not to be inferred that he did not know her until after he went into exile, and still less that he took her in the land of exile. It is narrated of Hannah, that she was the wife of Elkanah, and had been barren for a number of years: “it is then stated that “Elkanah knew Hannah his

* Genesis iv, 16.

† Id. i, 28.

‡ Id. ii, 24.

wife," and "after Hannah had conceived," "she bare a son," etc.* Not that he first knew her after she had been his wife for several years. "He knew his wife" is but a formulary by which the birth of a child is introduced, and has no reference to the time when she was taken to wife.

It is simple justice to Dr. Cartwright, however, to say, that he does not, as Mr. Scull supposes, design to destroy public confidence in the Scriptures.† On the contrary, he seems to labor, however injudiciously, to restore that confidence which he supposes may have been shaken by other ethnologists. While he agrees with Nott and Gliddon in believing that the science of ethnology reveals that there are several distinct, indigenous races of men, he thinks this, far from impeaching, confirms the truth of the Bible; for, says he:

"That book positively affirms that there were, at least, two races of intellectual creatures, with immortal souls, created at different times."—*De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 129. August, 1860.*

He declares that what he had learned in the book of nature, he found, to his surprise, had been revealed more than five thousand years previously in the Hebrew Bible.‡ He repeatedly extols the wisdom and knowledge of negro character and peculiarities exhibited in the Book of Genesis, and speaks of it as "what God reveals on the subject."|| In a subsequent article he vindicates the Bible from the assaults of "Voltaire and the illuminati of the last century;" of all who regard its first pages as a fable; and of "the learned authors of the '*Types of Mankind*,' and a great many other scientific men," whom the "hypothesis of a single species of the genus homo" has prejudiced against the Bible "as the revealed Word of God."§ His opinion that there are several distinct races of human beings, is founded on the Hebrew words, *naphesh chayah*, in the first and second chapters of Genesis. The proper translation of these words is in issue between him and Mr. Scull. The question is one of legitimate criticism, which must be adjusted by Hebrew scholars. But it is too much to assume with Mr. Scull, that to controvert the *historical* or the *received* meaning of the Scriptures, necessarily involves an attack on the Scriptures themselves. What he understands by their *natural* meaning, is not so obvious; but the object of all men ought to be to ascertain the *true* meaning of God's Word, whether it be sustained by ancient and contemporary interpretation or not. Mr. Scull well remarks, that "Scripture truth stands forth as God's truth;" but errors of translation—those apparent discrepancies

* I Samuel i, 2, 7; 19, 20.

† De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 715. December, 1860.

‡ Id., 135. August, 1860.

|| Id., 129, 131, 132, etc.

§ Id., 515, 516, 518. October, 1860.

which, as he says again, man has made—are not Scripture truth. Hence, Dr. Cartwright cannot properly be censured for endeavoring to give a correct version of any portion of God's Word, but only for not pursuing his investigation with that caution and humility which ought to characterize all philosophical inquiries, and, above all, such as implicate the Word of God.

Whilst it is just to exonerate Dr. Cartwright from any intention to disparage the Bible, it is obvious that the tendency of such wild speculation, under the guise of scientific research and learned criticism, is to unsettle the faith or confirm the infidelity of some who "are unlearned and unstable," and to encourage others in speculations even more visionary and pernicious. One who professes to believe in the divine authority of the Bible, is not justifiable in making his continued acceptance of any part of it depend on its containing a corroboration of some theoretic conception of his own. This Dr. Cartwright seems to do in the following paragraph:

"But, you may ask, is not the first part of Genesis a narration of events that could not possibly have been witnessed by any human being, and of what value can it be in the search of truth? It would be of no more value than Sinbad the sailor, if the narration did not prove itself by containing within itself the truth sought for. We are in search of the truth about negroes, whether they belong to the Adamic race or not."—*De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 131. August, 1860.*

The answer to the interrogatory cannot be accepted as a canon of criticism. It may mean that the narration, if not true, is a fable, which is a truism too jejune to be imputed to a writer of such pretensions and standing as Dr. Cartwright. It may mean that, if the narration does not contain the particular truth for which the critic may chance to be seeking, it is of no more value than the story of Sinbad, which would require that "the first part of Genesis" shall contain the truth on every conceivable subject of investigation, or it must be classed with the fable of Sinbad. Lastly, it may mean that the narration must be rejected unless it proves itself "by containing within itself" "the truth about negroes, whether they belong to the Adamic race or not." Such seems to be the meaning of Dr. Cartwright, since he specifies this as "the truth sought for." That is, if the Bible narrative does not contain Dr. Cartwright's theory, that the first created *naphesh chaiyah* were negroes, and that the *nachash* was one of them, it must be relegated to the realm of allegory. This seems like laying down as a canon for testing the divine authority of the Bible that, if it reveals what Dr. Cartwright stamps with his signet, it is a revelation from God, but otherwise not.

Dr. Cartwright does not enforce the opinion that the *nachash* originally walked erect, and was endowed with the gifts of speech and reason, by any new evidence, but contents himself with the arguments of Dr. Clarke. Then, so far as his theory

depends on that opinion, it has already been overthrown. And if Dr. Clarke failed to show that the curse against the *nachash* was fulfilled in the ape, still more unfortunate have been the efforts of Dr. Cartwright to make it quadrate with the condition of negroes. He says:

"When at work in the fields, they do not stoop like white people; their heads being thrown back, their knees bent, their legs bowed out, their feet flat, hips thrown upward, their abdomens are brought parallel with the earth, as if moving over its surface on their bellies. 'Upon thy belly shalt thou go,' said Elohim to the *nachash*."—*De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 135. August, 1860.*

This description, if in any case correct, certainly does not apply to thousands of negro slaves employed as mechanics, house servants, coachmen, wagoners, and in various other ways; but only to those "at work in the fields;" nor to them, except such as pick cotton; nor yet to these, except while actually engaged in that work. Indeed, the description is the offspring of Dr. Cartwright's imagination, and is akin to that similitude of Mr. Robert Montgomery, which Macaulay pronounces the worst in the world:

"The soul, aspiring, pants its source to mount,
As streams meander level with their fount."

"If streams did meander level with their founts," says Macaulay, "no two motions can be less like each other than that of meandering level and that of mounting upward." And moving, as all quadrupeds do, with the abdomen parallel with the earth, is quite as little like "moving over its surface on the belly," like the serpent kind. In the curse is no "as if" on thy belly; but simply "on thy belly." According to Dr. Cartwright's gloss, the curse ought to have been written, "while picking cotton in the fields, thy abdomen shall be brought parallel with the earth, as if moving over its surface on thy belly." Unfortunately for this fine theory, "upon thy belly shalt thou go, said Elohim to the *nachash*." This the serpent does in fact; the negro, not even in appearance. But the idea that the Almighty gravely cursed the beguiler by condemning him to carry his belly more parallel with the earth, while at work in the fields, than white people do, is too puerile to deserve even this much notice.

Applying his theory to that portion of the curse which condemns the *nachash* to eat dust, Dr. Cartwright continues:

"We have only to look at them eating the bread, which they prefer to all other kinds of bread, the *ash-cake*, and to witness their fondness for the ashes, and eating dust by the handfuls, to see rewritten upon living negroes a translation of the Hebrew word, 'and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.'"—*De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 135. August, 1860.*

If proof is to be derived from a fondness for the *ash-cake*, many of "the Adamic race" are *nachashim*, for a very large

number of the whitest whites regard it a truly delicious and healthful food, and prefer it "to all other kinds of bread." Dr. Cartwright adds :

"They are the only people in the world who are victims of the peculiar disease called dirt-eating, cachexia Africana, or negro consumption." *Id. ib.*

It is not necessary to remind Dr. Cartwright that, according to medical authorities, this disease, though sometimes real, is more frequently feigned; and that the native Africans, in the Indies, took this method to commit suicide, under the superstitious idea that they would revive in Africa; and that there are diseases common to white people which produce various kinds of pica. They state, for example, that chlorosis causes a morbid appetite for magnesia, chalk, lime, coals, ashes, clay, and other absorbents. As a literary gentleman, Dr. Cartwright will probably remember the case of Sabina Green, who, from eating oatmeal, champing tobacco-pipes, licking chalk, and nibbling sealing-wax, fell to eating thunderbolts, and then devoured the garden wall half a foot toward a neighbor's yard, and would have eaten quite through, but that she became too lazy to stir out, and contented herself with scratching coals in her chamber.* The evil reprehended in this fictitious character must have been of frequent occurrence with the "Adamic race" of England, to require this cautionary notice from the Spectator. Admitting, however, that dirt-eating is strictly confined to negroes, it is not with them the rule, but the exception; whereas the eating of dust, in whatever sense intended, was to be the rule with the *nachash*, and exemption the exception, if any exception is supposable. Negroes may be frequently attacked by this disease; yet a disease it is, and not the normal condition of the negro race. Dr. Cartwright makes it a disease of the mind, resulting from snake-worship, the negro's "indigenous superstition;" though it is not so easy to perceive why worshipping snakes should make the stomach crave dirt.

If Dr. Cartwright would have it believed that the translators of the Bible ought to have "rendered the word *nachash* as the great Hebrew scholar, C. Blanchard Thompson, has rendered it, by the word negro,"† he should show that the negro is "cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field." He must accomplish the impossibility, which he has not even attempted, of showing that God "put enmity between" the negro and the woman, and between his seed and her seed; and that, as the result of that enmity, the seed of the woman, in its double sense, first as the Messiah, and secondly as the Adamic race, has bruised, or will bruise, the negro's head; and that the negro has bruised, or will bruise, his heel—understanding the negro also in two senses: first, as Satan, who assumed the

* Spectator, No. 431.

† De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 134. August, 1860.

negro's form, and is, therefore, figuratively, called by his name; secondly, as the literal negro. The literal sense has sometimes been fulfilled. White men have sometimes bruised the heads of negroes, and these have occasionally returned the compliment, not on the heel, but the head of the white man. But white men have more frequently bruised the heads of whites than of negroes. To assume that the continual strife between the Northern and Southern states on account of the negro, resulting in the destruction of a once proud, powerful, and glorious government, is the bruising of the white man's heel, would be in keeping with Dr. Cartwright's theory, and quite as probable as any part of it. There is confusion, inconsistency; and contradiction in Dr. Cartwright's partial application of this part of the curse. In connection with his remarks concerning dirt-eating, he says:

"Happily, as foretold, the seed of the woman is bruising the head of the serpent, and Christianity is setting the poor negro free from slavery to that evil spirit which seizes upon him whenever he gets beyond hearing of the crack of the white man's whip."—*De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 136. August, 1860.*

What has the serpent's head to do with it? According to Dr. Cartwright's theory, it was the serpent-worshipper's head that was to be bruised—the head of the *nachash*, which, he says, should be translated *negro*. Moreover, he confounds blessing and curse, and makes the blessing consist in "bruising the head of the serpent," though his theory excludes the serpent, and inflicts the bruise on the negro's head. And this bruising of the negro's head is made to consist in setting the negro free from slavery to an evil spirit. In this the negro is not cursed, but rather blessed "above every beast of the field." Interpreting the whole sentence by the aid of the context, it seems to mean that the Messiah is gaining a victory over satan, because Christianity is curing the negro of his liability to the disease of dirt-eating, which is a consequence of snakeolatry. If so, bruising the head of the *nachash* is a blessing to the negro; therefore the negro was not the object of the curse recorded by Moses; that is, he was not the *nachash*.

Dr. Cartwright endeavors to press into his service every definition of the word *nachash*, even those which are most against him. He says:

"We see around it the serpent—the charmed—the enchanted—watching closely—prying into designs—muttering and babbling without meaning—hissing—whistling—deceitful—artful—fettors—chains—and a verb formed from the name which signifies to become *black*."—*De Bow's Review. New Series. Vol. iv, p. 131. August, 1860.*

Here he endeavors to justify his filling up of Dr. Clarke's sketch of the *nachash* with sable pigments; but Mr. Scull denies that any "verb is formed from the name which signifies to be or to become black." Between these two and other Hebrew

scholars, this issue must be left. As it was undeniable that *nachash* sometimes properly means "serpent," and sometimes expresses the ophidian act of "hissing," even this is made an argument to prove that, in the third chapter of Genesis, it does not mean a "serpent," but a negro! To give this plausibility it is said :

"We have in the Northwest a tribe of Indians called Snakes. The name was intended to be significant of some peculiar trait in their character."—*De Bow's Review*. Vol. iv, p. 134. August, 1860.

Of course, it is not intended to identify these with the *nachash*, for that would destroy the nigritian theory. The reader is left to draw the inference that Adam, who named all creatures, may have called a negro a snake, because of some peculiar trait. Indians frequently take the names of animals possessing qualities which they value in a brave. One of those qualities is a noiseless approach to surprise an enemy. Hence a tribe, boasting of this quality, may well have assumed the name of Snakes. But this tends no more to establish Dr. Cartwright's theory than the fact that there is a city called Buffalo and a country called Turkey. If it had been shown that the Egyptian worshippers of the cat, ibis, and other creatures were called by the names of the animals to which they devoted themselves, it would have been in point; for the negro trait on which Dr. Cartwright relies is thus set forth :

"Nearly all the ancestors of the negroes now in the United States, were the *slaves of the serpent* before they became the slaves of Christian white men. They worshipped their snake master, believed that the serpent-god was all-wise, all-powerful, and *very wicked*." *De Bow's Review*. Vol. iv. p. 133. August, 1860.

Dr. Cartwright's theory proceeds on several unwarrantable assumptions: first, that Adam adopted the Indian method of applying to humans the names of animals, "to be significant of some peculiar trait in their character;" secondly, that the trait selected had reference to the object of their worship; thirdly, either that snake-worship had commenced in the Garden of Eden, where the Lord, the true God, was wont to walk "in the cool of the day;" or, that Adam, gifted with prophetic vision, foresaw that it would prevail among the negro race; and, fourthly, that the serpent was named before the negro. But the last assumption conflicts with another of Dr. Cartwright's statements, namely :

"We are told that all the creatures were brought before Adam to receive names, and that what he called every living creature, that was the name thereof. What these names were appears afterward. The first one of these names is *Nachash*. That is the name of the creature which beguiled Eve." *De Bow's Review*. Vol. iv, p. 131.

But, if Adam called this creature *nachash*, "serpent," because he worshipped a serpent, the reptile, after which he was named,

must have been named before him; and he was not the first named. Then the order must have been reversed, and the snake named *nachash* because it was the object of the adoration of the *nachash* or negro. In either case, we find Adam giving the same name to different creatures; the one a human being, the other a reptile. This, of course, would have created great confusion, making it frequently doubtful whether a human being or a snake was denoted.

There are various other objections to Dr. Cartwright's method of fastening the same Hebrew name on the serpent and the negro. First, it is not certain that the African negroes really worship serpents. While Dr. Cartwright affirms that the tribes "which make the best slaves were, before they became the slaves of the white man, *the slaves of a serpent*;" Rev. Dr. J. Lewis Kraff, a traveller in Africa, states that throughout the whole of eastern Africa fetichism is unknown; that the powerful nation of Gallas, or Oroma, possess a purer faith than any of the heathen tribes of eastern Africa, and that they are held in high estimation as slaves. Dr. Barth, whose observations were made in North and Central Africa, thinks that the original religion of nearly all the African tribes was a worship of the elements, the sun and moon, and the souls of their ancestors; that their forms of worship are now more grotesque than at a former period; and that the religious rites of the interior—the most remote from the influence of the white man—are far purer than those near the coast. Rev. T. J. Bowen was for some years a missionary in Yoruba, which is coterminous with Dahomey, and quite as much immersed in superstition. His residence afforded him ample means for obtaining reliable information, and his occupation required him to improve his opportunities. He says:

"White men are generally much mistaken in regard to the religion and superstition of the negroes. They suppose that the idols are looked upon as gods; that the symbol is the idol; and that the greegree, or charm, is an object of worship—all of which is incorrect. As the people make a clear distinction between God and idols, so an idol, which is a real spiritual being, is not to be confounded with its symbol, which may be an image, a tree, or a stone."—*Smithsonian Contributions*, z.

In another work, the same writer says:

"Everybody in that country believes in one true and living God, of whose character they often entertain surprisingly correct notions. Most of the people worship certain imaginary creatures, whom they regard as mediators between God and men; but there are some who reject such mediation, and attempt to hold direct communication with God himself."—*Central Africa*, 159, 160.

"Their fetichism is precisely the same system of superstition which leads Mahometans, and Catholics, and many Protestants, to employ charms and amulets as a means of averting evil. The noble duke who fastened a horse-shoe to the marble steps of his palace, believed in the power of the fetish as well as the negro king who hangs amulets and charms in his house to

prevent the entrance of witches and devils. But the fetish is not *worshipped* either in Europe or Africa. It is not a mediator, but a 'medicine,' as the Indians and Africans call it, which preserves the superstitious from spiritual ills as drugs avert bodily maladies."—*Id.*, 312.

Mr. Bowen says much more on these subjects, but this is sufficient.

Secondly: Admitting that Africans worship the serpent, their worship is not confined to this creature. In Abomi, a village of Dahomi, the fetish is the serpent; but in the neighboring village of Whyda, it is the leopard. Again, to quote from Mr. Bowen:

"Some of these symbols, occasionally engraved on the temple doors of Obatala, deserve a more special notice. On several distinct panels are seen a fish, a land tortoise, and a serpent."—*Smithsonian Contributions*, x.

"Seeing a fine school of fish in the shallow water in the river, near the village, I made inquiries, and was informed that the people worship them as a sort of *orisha* or idol."—*Central Africa*, 174.

"The idols of Yóruba amount to three or four hundred, most of which are of little note. Some of them are spiritual creatures, superior to men, and different from angels; others are ancient heroes, or heads of families. They are often symbolized by trees, rivers and other natural objects; but the symbol is not the idol."—*Id.*, 313.

Why, then, should negroes be named for one object of worship rather than another? Why not call them leopards, fish, or tortoises, as well as serpents?

But, thirdly, the negroes have not had a monopoly of serpent worship; which, on the contrary, has been almost universal. Rev. Richard Watson says that the serpent has been worshipped "almost everywhere," and adds:

"Under this form, probably, the grand deceiver of the nations succeeded to transfer Divine honors to himself, and thus to revel in the degradation of mankind."—*Exposition, Rom. i.*, 23.

Another writer says that the first corruption of the worship of the Druids was the worship of the sun. He then continues:

"There soon followed, as among all other heathen nations, the worship of the serpent. The serpent's egg was the Druid's crest, and the actual serpent lay entwined at the foot of their altars. It is one of the most remarkable triumphs of that 'old serpent, the devil,' that he has succeeded in persuading fallen man, in every country and in every age, without exception, to adore that reptile form in which he destroyed the happiness of our first parents. In the Temple of Belus, at Babylon, were worshipped large serpents of silver. In Persia, serpents were considered the governors of the universe. The serpent Calya was worshipped in Hindostan, as was the serpent Python at Delphos. Under the form of the dragon, the serpent has, to this day, governed China and Japan. While the serpent worship of Syria and Egypt is shown by all the ancient history of those countries, it entered largely into the mythology of Greece and Rome."—*The Book and its Story*, pp. 78, 79.

Another writer says, that the serpent became an object of regard among the heathen world above most other animals;

and after assigning some reasons which probably induced the Hebrews to pay divine honors to the brazen serpent, he continues :

"The influence of example might have induced the Hebrews to take this fatal step; and the recollection that their forefathers looked upon it and lived, by the Divine command, might have confirmed them in their choice. Besides, although Scripture associates with the serpent all that is evil, and makes it even personate the wicked one, by the heathen world it was made the deified symbol of something good and beneficent; ideas which the Hebrews, perverted as they were, could not fail having of the brazen serpent. Thus, for instance, the *cerastes*, or horned snake, was sacred to Ammon, one of the Egyptian deities, and was interred, after death, in the temple of that deity; and the venomous *naia-haj* was regarded as an emblem of Cneph, their good deity. Among the Greeks and Romans, also, it symbolized "the good genius;" and Esculapius, the god of physic, was worshipped under the form of a serpent, which some writers think was derived from a tradition concerning the animal the sight of which restored the wounded Hebrews. It was from this idea that serpent-worship spread from Egypt among the nations of eastern Europe and western Asia, and it might also have influenced the Hebrews."—*Eastern Arts and Antiquities*, pp. 255, 256.

Even that "extatic state" into which, according to Dr. Cartwright, negro serpent-worshippers are thrown by coming near the serpent,* is not a phenomenon confined to the negro; but finds its parallel in the sect of Psylli. Nonnini, while in Egypt, saw a saadi of this sect devouring pieces of a living serpent, and agitated, during the process, even to a frenzy.† Nor has serpent-worship been limited to ethnic nations. Not only did the children of Israel burn incense to the brazen serpent that Moses had made,‡ but they

"Oft forsook
Their living strength, and unfrequented left
His righteous altar, bowing lowly down
To bestial gods."§

These were introduced even into the temple of the true God; and upon the wall round about were portrayed "every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel,"|| which

"Ezekial saw, when, by the vision led,
His eye surveyed the dark idolatries
Of alienated Judah."¶

Moreover, in the second century, there was a sect of Gnostic Christians called Ophites, or Serpentines, of whom it is said, that they were

[To be continued.]

* De Bow, vol. iv, 133. Aug. 1860.

† Mavor's Voyages, vol. 28, pp. 228, 229.

‡ II Kings, xviii, 4.

§ Paradise Lost, B. 1.

|| Paradise Lost, B. 1.

¶ Ezekiel viii, 10.

ART. VII.—MANUFACTURE OF WINES IN THE SOUTH.

EXPOSITION OF A PLAN TO OBIATE THE DISABILITIES OF CLIMATE OPPOSED TO THE
MANUFACTURE OF WINE IN SOUTH CAROLINA, ETC.

PART II.

The first point calculated to embarrass the chemist is the multitude of wines that the market presents. We have eight or ten apparently different kinds in common use; every wine country seems to present a different kind, and it is alleged that all these different kinds are the fermented juice of the grape. How many different kinds of grape juice were required to make so many different kinds of wine? Is it possible that the established unity of nature is destroyed, and that the grape of every country has a specific composition of its own? A careful examination of the composition of grape juice does not justify such a position; there is a unity of composition pervading them all, and the juice of the wild Bullace is as readily determined as the refined Chasselas of Fontainebleau. Grape juice varies in the relative quantity of its constituents, but the constituents themselves are always present. Wine may be alleged to be a production of nature; such is possible sometimes, but grape juice is always the produce of nature, hence it is safer to judge wine by grape juice than to judge grape juice by wine. If I find in a wine that which I know does not exist in grape juice, I may justly infer that it is an attempt of art to improve nature. If I am in the habit of finding in grape juice that which I do not find in a particular wine, I may justly infer that the wine is not the fermented juice of the grape, hence it is factitious and the sole product of man. If the determination of the genuineness of wines had been the object of this paper, the field of research was open, and the method of exploration simple; but my object was different. I have only examined some of the most celebrated foreign wines to determine how far the materials contained in our grape juices were capable of producing their like, fully persuaded that wine-making is an art in Europe, and each nation pursues its own method according to the mercantile objects in view and the habits and customs of the people. The wines of Germany, France, Spain, Portugal and Madeira, differ from each other much more than the differences of the grape juice will justify; and it is more than probable that if the wine makers of Oporto were transferred to Xeres, or the vines of Xeres transplanted to the Douro, we should have port wine coming from Xeres, and sherry wine coming from Oporto; for it is well known that any kind of wine may be made in any place out of any kind of grape juice, and frequently out of no grape juice at all. It is not impossible, at some future period, that Aiken may produce all the wines of the commercial world; when the wine artists of

Europe shall select this desirable village as the seat of their industry, and we may send to Aiken, as we do to Cetto, and direct any wine to be made to order of such an age or quality. To hasten this flourishing era, we have first to determine whether the grapes of Aiken are susceptible of this high destiny—whether they are equal in quality to those at present employed in Europe for the same purpose. That similar fruits should contain similar constituents is reasonably to be expected, and when we encounter similar fruits in different parts of the world, we may infer similar composition. If we subject identical fruits to identical examinations, we obtain identical results; hence we had a right to presume that the American grapes contained the same composition as the European, with about as many differences as exist among the European varieties. Varieties growing in the same vineyard will differ in subordinate details, whether the vineyard be in America or in Europe. Climate, soil, cultivation and care have their influences for good or for evil, but no contingency can so far change a vine as to make it lose the characteristics of its fruit. The fruit will always contain water, holding in solution potash and lime salts, free acids, tartaric principally, sugar, mucilage, pecten, essential and fixed oils, coloring and astringent matter, and woody fibres proceeding from the rupture of the organization of the fruit by the mechanical action of the press, and held in suspension. This woody fibre which is held in suspension, and on the complete removal of which depends the limpidity of the future wine, together with impurities which may accidentally fall into it, may be denominated fecula, and defecation may be applied to designate the process by which it is removed. Of the several constituents which enter into the composition of grape juice, the most important to determine are the acids and the sugar. The remainder may be determined sufficiently by the sight, the smell or the taste. The quantitative determination of the acid and sugar enable us, first, to decide the maturity of the fruit—for it is demonstrated that at maturity the acids will be at its minimum and the sugar will be at its maximum. Secondly, the knowledge of the quantity of acid and sugar enables us to predict the production of an acid or a strong wine—for excess of organic acids make an acid wine and deficiency of sugar will make a weak wine. The wines of Aiken are both acid and weak—attributable to the use of an immature grape which I shall show hereafter. The maximum of maturity may be determined by the maximum quantity of sugar which the grape can produce, and correlatively the minimum quantity of acidity. If this correlative be true, it may be sufficient for the vine grower to know how to determine one and infer the other. To demonstrate this truth, I have been compelled to employ both operations, one immediately after the other; and to prove that the processes are neither difficult nor

laborious, I have recorded the results of the examination of fifty-two specimens of grapes, twelve specimens of foreign wine and twenty-one specimens of domestic—making eighty-five double operations within two months—and it will be from this record that I shall draw my knowledge and experience. My object was to obtain a positive method of comparing the juice of grapes at different times, in order to determine advancing maturity, to compare different grapes with each other at the same times, and finally to compare grape juice with foreign and domestic wine; if the detection of factitious wines occurred, it was a sequence that came of its own accord, and when adulterations came in my way, I could not avoid seeing them.

The operations that I have employed are simple, and one is as old as Archimedes. The other, as far as I know, is a plan of my own. The determination of the sugar is a process that every wine grower should be conversant with, and depends upon the common principle of specific gravity. If sugar be heavier than water, it is manifest that water, having sugar in solution, must be heavier than pure water. And if alcohol be lighter than water, it is manifest that a mixture of alcohol and water must be lighter than pure water. It is also manifest that the weights of equal volumes of these materials will vary with their relative proportions. Without entering into the principles involved, which may be found in any book of philosophy, I propose to point out the simplest method of ascertaining the maturity of the grape by determining the specific gravity of the juice. To obtain the juice by mashing the grapes in a mortar, and squeezing the "toucsi" through a cloth. I possess a stoppered bottle which exactly contains 1000 grains weight of water, when at the temperature of 62°. I also possess a balance and corresponding grain weights. To hasten my operation, I prepared a counterpoise, which equals the weight of the bottle and water, which always occupies one pan of the balance; in the other I place the bottle containing the juice for determination. If the juice contains sugar, the 1000-grain bottle will outweigh the counterpoise, and I must add grains to the counterpoise until the equilibrium is established. This addition of grains, added to 1000, gives me the excess of weight produced by the presence of the sugar, and is called the specific gravity of the juice. The specific gravity will vary with the greater or lesser quantity of sugar, and gives us a simple and quick method of determining the quantity contained in the measure of one thousand grains of water. On the 1st of August, I took the specific gravity of the juice of the Catawba grape from Columbia, and found that it required 43 grains to establish the equilibrium; adding 43 grains to 1000 gave me 1043 as the specific gravity, and I so recorded it for future use. On the 18th August, I repeated the operation on the Catawba from Augusta, and found that it required 80

grains, hence 1080 was now its specific gravity. On the 26th of August 90 grains were required, hence 1090 was the specific gravity. On the 9th of September, and after the grapes had been kept nine days after gathering, the specific gravity mounted up to 1102. The grapes gathered from the same vine to be packed up with those gathered nine days before, had a specific gravity of only 1081, showing that the specific gravity had increased from the loss of water by evaporation, in that than a continued progress of maturity. Both parcels were sound, and much practical benefit may come out of the experiment of Dr. Cook, of Kaolin, to whom I am indebted for the specimens.

The purchased one thousand-grain bottle is decidedly the most convenient instrument for use. The calculations are already made, and it may be daily used in a few minutes. A substitute may be made at home, out of an apothecary's phial, which will require a daily calculation for the stand, and must be whatever the contents of water may weigh. Any other weight than 100 or 1000 must be proportioned, or we cannot translate the specific gravity into the proportion of sugar according to a prepared table. The universal hydrometer may be used, but we must have a table to translate the indications marked on the instrument into the true specific gravity, or it will be useless. With whatever instrument the specific gravity may be taken, it is certain that we can daily trace the progress of maturity of the fruit in our vineyards. We have thus a method of determining the ultimatum of maturity with certainty, and with safety. We can also avoid the evil of a too early vintage, and the production of an acid wine. Could it be once determined what the maximum specific gravity of every variety of grape would attain, we have the time of vintage of each variety pointed out to us—for it seems to be a law that after the perfect maturity of a fruit decay soon succeeds. The ordinary signs of maturity are deceptive, and many a vineyard is materially injured in reputation by a premature vintage. On the 29th July, I received a bunch of presumed ripe grapes; the specific gravity was 1065. On the 16th August, I received another bunch off of the same vine; the specific gravity was 1084. It is scarcely necessary to remark that the latter were riper than the former—or the first plucked grapes were green, and the last were not as ripe as they would have been had more patience been exercised. If the determination of the specific gravity had no other object than the determination of the progress of maturity of the grape, the cost of the instrument and the labor of the examination would be repaid by the daily gratification of an anxious curiosity. But the specific gravity leads us directly to the determination of the per centage of sugar contained in the juice, and from this may flow all the pleasant speculations of the richness and

strength of the future wine. The greater the proportion of sugar in the recent juice, the greater proportion of alcohol will there be in the wine, as we have already detailed. Now, if we have learned how to take the specific gravity, the next step is just as simple—for the specific gravity is but the index to the quantity of sugar added to a given quantity of water to increase its weight by that amount. A table, prepared by M. Nieman, of the specific gravity of solutions of different portions of sugar and water from a set of experiments made on purpose at the temperature of $63\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$, give us all that we require. I insert the table as necessary to my purpose in aiding the vine growers of Aiken:

NIEMAN'S TABLE OF SUGAR AND WATER.

Sugar.	Water.	Specific Gravity.	Sugar.	Water.	Specific Gravity.	Sugar.	Water.	Specific Gravity.
0	100	1.0000	16	84	1.0647	32	68	1.1389
1	99	1.0035	17	83	1.0698	33	67	1.1436
2	98	1.0070	18	82	1.0734	34	66	1.1484
3	97	1.0006	19	81	1.0784	35	65	1.1538
4	96	1.0143	20	80	1.0830	36	64	1.1582
5	95	1.0179	21	79	1.0875	37	63	1.1631
6	94	1.0215	22	78	1.0920	38	62	1.1681
7	93	1.0254	23	77	1.0965	39	61	1.1731
8	92	1.0291	24	76	1.1010	40	60	1.1781
9	91	1.0328	25	75	1.1056	41	59	1.1832
10	90	1.0367	26	74	1.1103	42	58	1.1883
11	89	1.0410	27	73	1.1150	43	57	1.1935
12	88	1.0456	28	72	1.1197	44	56	1.1989
13	87	1.0504	29	71	1.1245	45	55	1.2043
14	86	1.0552	30	70	1.1293	46	54	1.2098
15	85	1.0600	31	69	1.1340	47	53	1.2153

The practical use of the above table must be obvious on inspection. The first column contains the quantity of sugar that is dissolved in the quantity of water expressed in the second column, and the third column is the specific gravity of the compound. For use, we have only to seek out in the third column the numbers which correspond to the specific gravity of the juice, and on the same line of the first column we will find the number designating the per centage of the sugar in our juice. The numbers of specific gravity are carried to the fourth place of decimals in the table. This fourth number can be used by having fractions of a grain weight, or it may be omitted altogether, and the determination will be sufficiently accurate. For illustration: I desire to determine the increase of sugar which took place between two bunches of grapes, gathered from the same vine—one on the 29th July, the other on the 16th of August. The specific gravity of one was 1065,

the other was 1084. 1.0647, found in the third column, points out 16 in the first column. Hence, 16 sugar and 84 (second column) water give the composition of the juice. 1.0830, found in the third column, points to 20 in first column and 80 in second column. Hence, 20 is the quantity of sugar and 80 the quantity of water—indicating an increase of 4 parts of sugar on 16, equal to 25 per cent., in eighteen days. My observations, carried through August and September, by the assistance of the 1000-grain bottle and Nieman's table, have enabled me to ascertain what the maximum maturity of the grape may be, what its usual range has been, and what its minimum was. The minimum specific gravity that I have observed was, on the 4th August, obtained from the green berries, which I separated from the ripe from a bunch of Isabella from Columbia. My object was to contrast the green with the purple, as will more particularly appear hereafter, when treating of the acidity of grapes. The purple were far from ripe, and their respective specific gravities were 1040 and 1059, that is by the table $10\frac{1}{2}$ and $14\frac{1}{2}$ of sugar. The Isabella, or other blue grape from New York, examined on the 27th September, had a specific gravity of 1038, say 10 of sugar. That all these grapes were *green*, notwithstanding the green, purple and blue colors presented to the eye, I am strongly inclined to suspect. They were sour to the taste, which I consider a suspicious circumstance, but I will not decide until I compare them with others. The maximum specific gravity that I observed this season was in the Black July, gathered on the 15th September, which was 1,108, equal to $25\frac{1}{2}$ of sugar, sent by Dr. Cook from Kaolin, and the Catawba, from the same gentleman, gathered on the 1st September and kept nine days. The specific gravity was 1102, equal to 24 of sugar. The Black July of Aiken, August 26th, from A. Mazyck, Esq., was 1096, equal to 23 sugar. Warren, Cook, September 15, 1097, equal to 23 sugar. Red LeNoir, Mayrant, Columbia, 1092. Blande's Madeira, Cook, 1094. Little Wild Grape, Hammond, 1093. Isabella, Ravenel, 1090. It is apparent that the specific gravity, that is, the quantity of sugar, increases with time, and there is a point when patience is no longer a merit. It is certain that a specific gravity of 1090, for a whole vineyard, may be obtained, and, possibly, higher, but it should not be done by stripping the vines of all their fruit at one time: for two bunches out of the same parcel, and presumed to be from the same vine, yielded 1090 and 1085. It is reasonable to suppose that all the bunches on a vine will not ripen at the same time. The lower ones will most probably be in advance of the upper. At any rate, it is a matter worthy of attention among the vine growers, who, I presume, are now prepared to work for themselves. With the means of accurate information, relative to the contents of a grape, we may patiently and securely wait

for its full development. Each day or week gives notice of progress or rest, and, when improvement ceases, the vintage may commence. Each day is a gain, either in the secretion of more sugar or the evaporation of more water; and a judicious vine grower can, with proper consideration, select the exact time to secure the largest amount of what is valuable. I have reason to believe that much good fruit has been destroyed, and much sour wine made from premature vintages; and, as it will appear hereafter, green grapes cannot make ripe wine. Assuming, then, that the average specific gravity of grape juice in South Carolina is 1090, and may be raised to 1100 by patience and attention, we are prepared to compare our prospects with what is done in Europe. The minimum and maximum specific gravity of the must manufactured at Heidelberg is 1039 and 1091. That of Necker, Germany, varies from 1050 to 1090. The variation from the extreme north of France to the extreme south not only of France, but of Europe, is from 1062 to 1128. Thus it appears that the wines of Heidelberg and Necker are made from a must rather inferior to what South Carolina does or can produce, and that the wines of France are made from musts both weaker and stronger than those of our state. An examination of the wines of these several regions will prove that the grape juices which are converted into wine, fairly and honestly made, are not richer in sugar than our own. By calculations which are simple and just, we can deduce the specific gravity of the juice from which a given wine was made, provided that no alcohol has been added or taken away. We can also point out all such as have been brandied, watered, or otherwise altered, after we have determined the standard of the genuine. For study, pure specimens must be selected and from pure classes. The Rhenish and French wines belong to a pure class; that is, we have no reason to believe that the good brands have been composed or compounded. The madeira, sherry and port wines belong to another class, as will appear hereafter. That additions of brandy are made is not a secret, therefore they are of little value in determining the sweetness of the must. It is to be remarked that the sources from which the data are taken differ from each other. Brande gives the analyses as derived from specimens obtained in England, while Fontenelle give those as found in France. Fontenelle limits himself to French wines, and makes their strength about half that of Brande. Brande is admitted by recent analysts to be in excess, but such was probably the wine of his time. Dr. Christison, who has re-examined the subject, finds them to be less than Brande records, but he may have met with specimens sent to England to suit a higher class of drinkers. A little water, judiciously added, makes a strong wine a delicate one, and this is an art that may be practised to suit certain tastes. Taking Brande as our guide, we may first

examine the hock as the type of the Rhenish wines. We find it of two degrees of strength: one is represented to contain 13.31 by volume of absolute alcohol, equal to 10.56 by weight; the other contains 8.00 of absolute alcohol, equal to 6.35 by weight, that is to say, that one contains 10.56 per cent. of its weight of absolute alcohol, and the other contains 6.35 per cent. of its weight in absolute alcohol—a difference rather remarkable, which may be referred to a mature or immature vintage, as readily as to an artful addition of brandy or water. We have already shown that 100 pounds of grape sugar are required to produce 46.46 pounds of absolute alcohol, and reversely, 46.46 pounds of alcohol imply the destruction of 100 pounds of sugar for its production. Hence, to use smaller numbers, six parts of alcohol found in wine imply the former existence of ten parts of sugar in the juice. But this proportion allows no waste of alcohol by spontaneous evaporation during fermentation; hence, five to ten is a safer guide, and the general rule now admitted is, that sugar produces one half its weight of alcohol, and reversely, that alcohol requires double its weight of sugar for its formation. The application of this proportion to the two hocks shows one to have contained in the must 21.12 per cent. of sugar, and the other 12.70 per cent. hence, by M. Nieman's table, the specific gravity of one was 1087 and the other 1047. The two Burgundies of Brande contained 21.16 and 17.54 of sugar, corresponding to 10.58 and 8.77 of alcohol, which give a specific gravity to the must of 1088 and 1071. The two Bordeaux clarets were, of alcohol 11.99 and 9.48, of sugar 23.98 and 18.98, hence their specific gravities were 1101 and 1078. The two champagnes are 9.39 and 8.31 of alcohol, 18.98 and 16.62 of sugar, and hence made from musts of 1078 and 1066 specific gravity. The Roussillon, represented as the strongest French wine, contains 12.66 of alcohol, 25.32 of sugar, and of course a specific gravity of the must equal to 1107. Thus it is evident that none of the legitimate wines, as examined by Brande, were produced from musts richer in sugar than those of Aiken, and so far as the growth and maturity of the grape is involved, we need not despair of future success.

If we now apply the above method of calculation to the fashionable wines of England and the United States, we will see that, as sent to us, there is no grape that produces a must sufficiently rich in sugar as to produce such a quantity of alcohol as these wines are found to contain. That they are brandied, we discover without confession; and it is folly to suppose that the climate and soil of Madeira, Spain, and Portugal can produce grapes so far above the normal rate of sweetness as to produce the commercial wine of madeira, sherry and port. The presumed inferior musts of Aiken can produce these several wines when treated in the same manner; and it is idle to expect from nature that which art alone produces. The maxi-

mum specific gravity of the richest European must is represented to be 1128; the two madeiras of Brande require the must to have been 1122 and 1148; the two sherries, 1115 and 1125; and the two ports must have been 1136 and 1168! Drying the grapes, or boiling the juice, may have produced such a proportion of sugar, but it is much more probable that brandy was directly added to suit the taste of the English and American markets; and it is commercially important to these countries to export their bad wines in the shape of brandy, mixed with the good, if their customers prefer the mixture. The wine manufacture, like all others, is liable to accident; and if a bad wine is made, it is transferred to the still and converted into a good brandy. This must be sold, and it matters little whether it be smuggled out mixed with the wine, or in its own cask representing what it really is. It may be important to direct attention to the two classes of wine which I have examined. One is really the natural produce of the grape, dependent for its virtues on the flavor, sweetness, etc., of the fruit. Of this class are the French and German wines. They are the faithful representatives of the must, and express the quality of the wine. It is this class alone that can be honestly made in Aiken, and to which all attention should be directed. The flavor and richness will depend upon the kind and maturity of the fruit, and if they are not fac-similes of the French and German standards, habit will soon teach us to adapt our tastes to what we have. If the old taste for the other class should prevail, and men will have the standard of madeira, sherry, and port, we can mix them as well in Aiken as at Funchal, Xeres, and Oporto. Our bad wines can also make good brandy; and if the world prefer us to mix it, we can effect the accommodation without self-censure; for drunkenness is a suicide that will occur, whether the liquor be mixed in Europe or America. It is scarcely necessary to remark that the peculiar flavor of these strong wines, as well as the strength, is derived from the added brandy. In their use we are consuming a mixture of brandy and wine; and it is vain to expect that our grapes will be perfect enough to produce such a wine, except we add the brandy, in imitation of the Spanish and Portuguese customs. We might as well expect our vineyards to yield directly brandy by fermentation, as any wine like madeira, sherry, or port.

OF THE ACIDITY OF WINE AND GRAPE JUICE.

Many attempts to make wine have been made about Aiken from the produce of the vine, but I regret to add without much success. An excess of acidity has generally prevailed, and it is not easy to restore a taste already perverted by the use of European wines to enjoy so different an article, hence they are not much esteemed nor used. The production of an unpalatable wine, by following the European processes with presumed

strict care, and occasionally under the immediate charge of a presumed experienced and practical European wine maker, is not calculated to produce much encouragement, nor hasten the extension of vineyards. If a professional wine maker cannot make other than an acid wine the fault must be with the grape, for it is evident if our vintner can make a good wine in one place, he ought to be able to do the same in another. A careful consideration of causes and consequences involved will dispel this delusion, and demonstrate that Aiken does not possess all the natural advantages for wine making which exist in Europe, and that processes which are universally successful there will universally fail here. I have already alluded to the difference of temperature between the grape regions of Europe and South Carolina during the time of maturity of the fruit; this alone is sufficient to produce the difference in result, and adequate to explain the cause of all the disappointments. Fortunately assertions of this character have a firmer foundation than mere suspicion. They can be demonstrated, and the result of an examination will declare the source of the acidity by the kind of acid found. Wine making is a delicate and scientific chemical operation, and the blind routine of one country is not applicable in another. Modifications of practice must be made to suit particular circumstances, and these modifications must be based on principles previously known and applicable to the case. There is nothing easier than to detect an excess of acidity in wine recently made, and pronounce it a failure. The first experimental mouthful develops this distressing truth, but it does not develop the whole truth. The whole truth should declare the cause and suggest the remedy. Chemistry alone can do this, and if I have been successful in teaching my readers how to apply the principles of physics to determine the quantity of sugar in grape juice, they will not object to take a lesson in chemistry, in order to learn how to detect the kind and quantity of acid which destroys the wine, and the kind and quantity of acid which exists in the grape at all periods of its development in greater or lesser amount. Speculations proceeding in active minds from positive data are generally successful, while speculations from no data at all, or false data, lead to ruin. It is clear that if the wine maker knows the principles of his art, and the exact composition of his materials, he can successfully vary his processes to suit contingencies, and need not live in the perpetual dread or anxiety of doing wrong at the last moment, and sacrificing his years labor. The determination of the quantity of acid in grape juice at all periods of growth, will materially aid in deciding the perfection of maturity, and thus avoid a common cause of acid wine. The determination of the kind of acid in his wine will immediately declare whether it is the produce of the grape or the produce of the fermentation—a distinction of great practical

importance, for it will inform him whether the error was committed in the vintage or in the fermentation, and the like error may be avoided on another occasion. Knowing that I would have many wines and juices to examine in order to accomplish the end I had in view, I commenced operations by devising the simplest plans for accomplishing the fewest objects. I decided that the determination of but two acids would answer my purpose. I concluded to unite all the acids of the grape into one, under the common name of the tartaric; and whether they be tartaric, racemic, malic or citric, the practical result would be the same, my reagent would act upon one or all, and if always applied in the same manner, the same results indicating quantity would always flow from juices containing the same quantities. A little practice settled this point. Comparative, not absolute quantity, was what I desired, and that I obtained. Under the impression that the tartaric acid was the most abundant in the grape, my thoughts turned upon a reagent best suited to its detection, and the neutral tartrate of potash was selected for trial.

My reasons for this choice were that neutral tartrate of potash was soluble in water, and had a strong disposition to unite with more tartaric acid, and form another compound, bi-tartrate of potash, which was insoluble in water; hence, on the addition of a solution of neutral tartrate of potash to grape juice, I had the satisfaction of seeing a white precipitate, indicating the presence of tartaric acid, which white precipitate was bi-tartrate of potash. It should here be remarked, that any other free acid besides the tartaric will produce the same precipitate; but we know that there are no other free acids in grape juice than those enumerated above; and, although they do not unite to produce the same insoluble salt, their action is precisely analogous. If we form our reagent upon citric acid, bi-tartrate of potash is formed: not by converting citric acid into tartaric, but by the union of the citric acid with a portion of the potash, and thus liberating a portion of the tartaric, which immediately unites with another portion of the remaining neutral tartrate, and converts it into bi-tartrate. Thus it is apparent that our reagent exhibits the presence of all the free acids that may be in the juice, and that is precisely what we desire that it should do. The quantity of bi-tartrate precipitated indicates the quantity of all the free acids present in the juice, without reference to what they may be; and if this precipitate is carefully separated, dried, and weighed, we can certainly learn how much acidity was in the juice, and thus compare any number of juices, or the same juice any number of times. The same reagent is equally applicable to wine, with a certain modification, which enables us to discriminate between the acid formed during fermentation, and those pre-existing in the grape juice. The only acid which it is import-

ant to distinguish and separate from the normal acids of the juice, is the acetic; and as this is volatile, it is perfectly separable by distillation. Therefore, in the examination of a wine, we first determine the whole quantity of free acid present in a given quantity of the wine. We then submit the same quantity to distillation, and apply the same reagent to the distillate. The quantity of acid found in the distillate is the quantity of acetic acid, which, subtracted from the whole quantity found in the wine, leaves us the quantity of tartaric and other acids pre-existing in the grape juice from which the wine was made.

The performance of these operations requires a little apparatus, and some skill and practice in manipulation. It also necessitates the modes of calculation by which we deduce the quantity of tartaric acid, and also the quantity of acetic acid from the quantity of bi-tartrate of potash obtained. The formula which I have universally used is as 1868 : 654 :: A : x, A being the bi-tartrate of potash found, and x the tartaric acid to be found—654 parts of tartaric acid correspond to 495 parts of acetic; thus the conversion of the tartaric acid into acetic can be easily accomplished. But I have never considered it necessary—for the object was to establish a uniform simple mode, which could be easily and quickly performed without requiring absolute accuracy. It is certain that all the researches are made in the same manner, and on equal quantities of the material; hence, with ordinary care, all defects or errors of the plan are common to every operation, and do not affect the comparative results. Without further details of the processes, which are best learned by seeing the operation performed, I will proceed to state the observations that I have made during the present summer (1860). I had a strong conviction that the acidity of the Aiken wines proceeded in part from the use of immature grapes. I had always known, that is, since I read Esop's fables, that green grapes were sour, but I never knew how much more sour they were than ripe ones. I had never eaten any other than sour grapes, and I was disposed to believe that all were sour. The birds and the insects in Charleston compel us to eat green grapes or none at all, and I reasonably supposed that Aiken was under the same ban. I also had a conviction that, in the maturity of fruit, the acid diminished as the sugar increased—for, as the increase of sugar masked the taste of the acid, the tongue was not a correct test: for it was possible, in artificial mixtures, so to conceal the acid by an excess of sugar that the taste could not detect its presence, although it was known to be there. To settle positively these points, I devised the plan of investigation as already detailed, and commenced operations, on the 29th of July, on a bunch of Warren grapes presumed to be ripe, and sent as a present to a friend. They were colored, and juicy, and tart, and possibly could be eaten by some. I submitted one ounce of the juice to

my process, and obtained 3.78-100 grains of acid. On the 16th of August, I obtained another bunch from the same vine, and treated it in the same manner. It then yielded 1.78 grains—that is, in eighteen days, it had lost two grains of its acidity; but, during the same time, it had gained 18.60 grains of sugar. It is thus evident that the two operations performed upon the juice, at different times, has clearly and truly revealed the quantities of acid and sugar existing at the time of each examination, and the difference between the two declares the progress of maturity. On the 4th August, I purchased some bunches of Isabella grapes, said to be from Columbia, on which some were purple and others were green in color. I carefully separated the different colored berries, and submitted each to examination. The colored indicated 2.82 grains of acid, and the green 6.73 grains—a difference rather remarkable in berries from the same bunch. The difference in acids was 3.91, and the difference in sugar was 17 grains in favor of the purple. That all of these berries were unripe may be proved by an examination repeated on another bunch of the Isabella in the same condition, obtained from Mr. Ravenel, Aiken, on the 24th August. The purple yielded 0.49 grains, and the green 2.35 grains. The purple berries of this bunch contained less acid than any grape I examined during the whole season; and although it did not contain as much sugar as other varieties of grape, still it should be esteemed the ripest fruit. The difference of acid was 1.86 grains, the difference in sugar was 31.66 grains, to the ounce of juice. Mr. Dangerfield's Warren grape, on the 4th August, yielded 4.05 of acid; on the 16th September, 1.33. Chisolm's Black July, on 4th August, was 2.13; on the 16th August, it had diminished to 1.86. It is unnecessary to multiply examples of this kind. The observations of the season concur in the demonstration that, as time advances, the quantity of free acid in the grape diminishes and the quantity of sugar increases. By future observations, we can determine the maximum maturity of each variety, and consequently determine the time of vintage. The same variety of grape does not always acquire the same degree of maturity at the same time in the same place, nor in different places. Messrs. Ravenel and Mazyck gave me the Blande's Madeira, on the same day, in Aiken. I examined them on the same day in Charleston, August 24th. Ravenel's acid was 0.69; Mazyck's 1.57. Ravenel's sugar was 83.22, Mazyck's sugar 91.98. Thus each had an advantage over the other, and their grapes were very different. Without knowing the fact, I would venture to guess that Ravenel's soil contained more potash than Mazyck's, by the aid of which the free acid was converted into the neutral salts, and thus escaped the action of the reagent—for it is alone the free acids that the neutral tartrate of potash can detect and separate. All of Mr. Ravenel's grapes exhibited the same

paucity of acids. On the 10th September, I received the Blande's Madeira from Kaolin. It was more acid and sweeter than Mazyck's; possibly a less supply of potash produced this result. It contained of acids 1.71, and of sugar 98.55 grains. Thus it seems, from the few examples that I have selected from my note book, that each vineyard is a study of itself, and each vintner must become a student if he wishes to surmount the natural obstacles that he is destined to encounter. Grape growing and wine making may be considered as two separate professions, but they are two professions that must be concentrated in the same individual; and the habits of observation and study which are necessary to prepare for one can also be applied to prepare for the other. Routine may be practiced by our servants, but the reasons of routine should be known to the master—and variations of routine should be made by him alone after good and sufficient reflection on the points involved. Certainty of knowledge secures accuracy of action; and he who always acts upon certainty of data is successful, and is considered a judicious and lucky speculator. If a judicious use is made of the little instruments which I have described, with the accompanying processes, to determine the quantity of sugar and acid in our grapes, it is certain that we introduce certainty into what was uncertain before. The instruments, and a practical knowledge of their use, may prove as valuable to the vine grower as the vineyard itself—for what is the value of a field to one unable to attend it. Complete sets of instruments may be prepared by the instrument makers, containing all necessary articles, with ample descriptions of their objects and purposes. A small room, set apart for their use, constitutes a laboratory, where every vine grower can hold communion with his vines, and obtain, by interrogation, all the knowledge which is necessary to control acres of land, and make them subservient to his use and prosperity.

PART III.

We may now turn our attention to the consideration of the wines of Aiken, and apply our acquired knowledge to investigate their defects. It is universally admitted that they are too acid, and a comparison with European wines will show that this charge is founded in justice. The excess of acidity may proceed from immaturity of the grape from which it was fermented, or from acids derived from the process of fermentation itself, or from an after-fermentation in the casks or bottles from defective corkage or other stoppage. From what has been detailed, the process of examination must be familiar to the reader. He will first add an excess of neutral tartrate of potash to one ounce of the wine; shake, settle, decant, dry and weigh the precipitate of bi-tartrate potash; calculate the quantity of tartaric acid, and set it down as the whole quantity of acid

in that ounce of the wine. He will then introduce another ounce of the same wine into a retort, adapt a receiver, apply a lump, and distil it nearly to dryness; he will have all the alcohol, all the acetic acid, and nearly all the water in the receiver; this is transferred to a proper vessel, and treated, as in the first instance, with neutral tartrate potash. The precipitate, if any, collected from this distillate, will indicate the quantity of acetic acid if correctly calculated. He will now have the whole quantity of acid from the wine, and the quantity of the acetic acid from the distillate. The subtraction of one from the other, gives the quantity originally in the grape and the quantity derived from fermentation. I submitted one ounce of German Steinwein, branded "Ausbruch," that is to say, the first flow from the grape, 1846, to the above operation, and obtained 2.34 grs. as the quantity of all the acids. I submitted another ounce to previous distillation, and treated the distillate in the same manner, and obtained 0.20 grs. of acetic acid; 0.20 subtracted from 2.34 leave 2.14 grs., which was the quantity of free acid existing originally in the grape, and the 0.20 was the produce of fermentation, primary or secondary. To obtain standards of comparison for Aiken wines, and ascertain what the original acidity of the European grapes were, I submitted several to the first examination, and report the results as follows: My Madeira, Leacock, 1839, 2.29; Madeira, Leacock, 1839, 2.58; Sherry, 2.34; Sauterne, 2.67; Claret La Hue, Margeaux, 1848, 1.74; Champagne, Minet & Chandon, 1.93; Claret, ordinaire, 2.28; Champagne, Lecureux & Lefournier, Arize, 2.08; Claret, St. Emmillon, 1.99—small as this quantity of acid seems to be, I have every reason to believe that it is correct. I dissolved these quantities of tartaric acid in one ounce of water, and tasting the wine and the water alternately I could not perceive much difference. The wine had the advantage of other bin-acid salts in its composition which the water had not, hence the wine should have been more acid than the acidulated water. Knowing the bi-tartrate of potash to be slightly soluble in wine as well as water, and to ascertain the amount of error that would arise from this cause, I added one grain to one ounce of the Steinwein, and found it to be saturated, hence it could dissolve no portion of the precipitate formed by the neutral tartrate. On completing this operation I obtained 2.43 of tartaric acid, showing an increase $\frac{9}{100}$ of one grain—an amount too small for consideration, but which may be adopted as the amount of error which prevails in all the examinations, and, being common to all, will not affect the comparisons.

Since the determination of the amount of free acids in the European wines, I received the Patent-office Report of 1859, which, in a measure, confirms their accuracy. On the 95th page, we read: "Experiments continued for eight years have proved that, in favorable seasons, grape juice contains, in the

average, in 1,000 pounds: sugar, 240 pounds; free acids, 6 pounds; water, 754 pounds." If this be reduced to the ounce of $437\frac{1}{2}$ grains, such as I have employed, we have the sugar as 105.00 grains, the acids as $2.62\frac{1}{2}$, and the water as $329.87\frac{1}{2}$ grains, equal to $437\frac{1}{2}$ grains. If this be assumed as a normal compound, according to the views of Drs. Gale and Petiol, we have a standard of comparison which is as applicable to wine as to grape juice. My determinations of the several foreign wines are in the neighborhood of this standard; and if they are genuine, as asserted to be, the wines and the standard mutually prove each other. These determinations also include any acetic acid that may have been developed during or after fermentation. The total acidity is what has been determined, without an attempt being made to distinguish one acid from another. There was no excess of acidity to the taste, and there was no reason to presume that the wine was made from green grapes, nor had suffered from the accidents of fermentation or subsequent neglect. It is by these standards that the wine of Aiken should be judged; and if it does not correspond, the wine makers should alter their plans and processes, until they produce a wine that does correspond with the standard and taste of the world. Drs. Gale and Petiol have published a plan of making wine out of any grape juice simply by adding the quantity of any element that may be deficient in the juice, or adding more of other elements when one is in excess, so that the normal proportion shall always be preserved. (See Pat. Off. Report, 1859, page 94 and seq.) In reporting the results of my examinations of some of the Aiken wines, I desire the parties interested to be assured that I design no injury nor offence. They must see as well as others, that acid wines are not relished in our community—that the Rhenish wines are not popular; and if the Steinwein was made in Aiken, the greater portion would remain on hand as unsaleable. If a wine like the Steinwein, containing 2.34 grains of acid, is found to be too sour for pleasant drinking, what will be said of wine containing 6.90 or 5.37 grains of acid. Will it not be charitable to offer both sugar and water with such a wine? I have been charged with being no judge of wine, because I pronounced a wine made in Charleston to be sour which contained 17.74 of acidity. Porter's French white wine vinegar contained only 18.07 grains of acid. On the other hand, I was allowed to be a judge of sour wine when I reported unfavorably on a wine containing 8.31 grains to the ounce. Such wines as the above have been accidentally made in South Carolina; but, on the other hand, better wines have also been made. I received a red wine from Mr. Caradeuc, which contained 2.56 grains of acid; a white wine from Marion, 2.64 grains; Scuppernong of North Carolina, 1.53 grains; Catawba, Cin., 1.21 grains; Witpen, Charleston, 3.12 grains; Thomson, Charleston, 1854, 2.73 grains;

Thomson, Charleston, 1857, 3.21. That some of these wines were improved by the addition of sugar and brandy I confess, but, nevertheless, an improvement is not necessarily an adulteration.

The most recent and interesting examination of wine, made in the vicinity of Aiken, I was enabled to accomplish by the assistance of the President of the late Convention, the Hon. J. H. Hammond. He asserted his belief that a good wine could be made in Aiken, and that he had done it at Redcliffe. I expressed a doubt, and the examples were sent to determine the truth. He discovered, some years since, that a frame house had not the virtues of a wine-cellar; he, therefore, transferred his wine manufactory to a twenty feet cellar, and in this cellar the wine was made which he maintained was sound and good. The result of the examination proved satisfactory to us both, and almost amounts to a demonstration that cellars will make sound wine when frame buildings will not. An example of this kind was what I had desired. I, therefore, entered on the examination with considerable anxiety as well as pleasure. The Catawba wine of 1859 was opened and tasted. It was not as sour as Steinwein, and had no sweetness. On submitting it to the examination for all the acids I found but 2.02 grains. On submitting another equal portion to distillation nearly to dryness, I tested the distillate and found nothing. No acetic acid had been formed during, nor subsequent to fermentation, indicating that no accident had happened, nor fault committed during that delicate process. The wine was perfect so far as the chemical process was concerned. The 2.02 grains of acid must be referred to the original acid that was in the juice of which the wine was made, and enables us to decide upon the maturity of the grape at the time of the vintage. The acid then was 2.02. By reference to the examination of the Catawba grape throughout the summer of 1860, in the vicinity of Aiken, Augusta and Columbia, I find the diminution of the acids to be as follows: August 1st, 3.66; Aug. 18th, 1.26; Aug. 24th, 0.82; Aug. 30th, 0.84. Later examples were richer in sugar, but the acid was 1.07-1.15-1.18. From these examples, we may infer that 1.00 may be the minimum of acidity that the Catawba grape will acquire, and that the vintage presenting an average of 2.02 was premature—not only in the excess of acid, but in the deficiency of sugar; but of this I desire only to make a note for the future. I may here remark, that differences of locations about Aiken begin already to make differences of maturity in the same grape. Mr. Ravenel's Catawbas were more ripe on the 24th August than Dr. Cook's were on the 30th, by 0.02 of acidity—the sugar of both being equal. The Catawbas of Mr. Crowell were richer in sugar than either of the above, but the acid was greatly in excess, being 2.34 and 1.57, taken from two bunches from the same basket on the 26th August. Potash may be

rare in Mr. Crowell's vineyard at Bluffton. I have made this digression to suggest the possibility that had the juice contained less acid and more sugar, the wine might have been better; and that a later vintage would have accomplished both objects, perhaps.

The second Hammond wine examined was the Catawba of 1860, also made in the twenty-foot cellar. The success in this case was not so perfect as that of 1859. The total acidity was 2.17, while the quantity of acetic acid was 0.36, showing a disposition to assume the acetic fermentation. The grapes, however, were more mature than in 1859, for the original acid in the fruit was 1.81. If the acetic acid fermentation does not continue to progress, it must be considered a fair wine, as the acidity is below the standard limit. 0.20 of acetic acid found in Steinwein is not considered detrimental; 0.36 is but a small increase, and is more than compensated for by the greater maturity of the Catawba over the Rheinisch grape.

The third Hammond wine is the Warren of 1856, made and preserved in a basement. The total acidity is 1.74; the acetic acid 0.43—showing the original acidity of the grape to have been 1.31. From defective corkage it has acquired a bad flavor, but in other respects it is sound.

The fourth Hammond wine is the Warren of 1859, prepared in the twenty-foot cellar. Total acidity, 2.85; acetic acidity, 1.34—indicating considerable progress in the acetic acid fermentation, and diminishing the hopes of the efficacy of twenty-foot cellars. On reporting the condition of this wine I received in reply the following explanation, which is adequate to account for the occurrence and redeem the reputation of the cellar:

"The Warren wine of 1859 I left in charge of my vintner, who racked it twice last spring. Before it was thus racked, my sons and neighbors declare that it was first-rate young Madeira."

Racking in the spring was certainly injudicious, but the wine must have been exceedingly delicate to have suffered so severely by the operation. The liability to assume the acetic acid fermentation from processes incident to the manufacture of wine indicates a deficiency of alcohol, and makes their durability very questionable. In order to determine the quantity of alcohol in these wines compared with the Steinwein, I submitted equal quantities of the Catawba of 1859, and Steinwein, to Brande's method of ascertaining the amount of alcohol. The result was as 7.25 in the Catawba to 12.90 in the Steinwein. I took, also, this occasion to determine the comparative quantity of undecomposed sugar in the two wines. In the Steinwein I found 4.37 grains in the ounce, and in the Catawba 2.48 grains to the same quantity. It is worthy of remark that the quantities of alcohol and sugar in the two wines bear a similar ratio

to each other—12.90 : 4.37 : : 7.25 : 2.45, as if the quantity of alcohol formed determined the quantity of sugar which remains unconverted. If this coincidence should prove to be a law, it will explain many circumstances which are now obscured, and give us a method of sweetening weak, sour wines, without incurring the danger of exciting a fresh fermentation. The common concurrence of weakness and acidity in the same wine may find an explanation in this law, for the paucity of the alcohol has allowed all the sugar to ferment, and none remains to mask the acidity of the original organic acids.

The factitious wines are never chargeable with being too weak nor too acid, for the artist knows that weakness and acidity are not qualities which make a wine saleable; he, therefore, avoids this error, but in making a natural wine we have not the same discretion—the wine must be made according to the composition of the grape juice; and if this is deficient in the proper proportion of sugar, a weak and acid wine must be the result, unless art interferes to obtain greater maturity in the fruit, or adds those constituents which the wine demands to enable it to compete in market with established European brands. The quantity of alcohol, as found in the Hammond wine of 1859, seems to be less than the Catawba juice was capable of furnishing. We do not know now what its sweetness really was—we do not know what the difference may be—between selected bunches of Catawba grapes and the average of a whole vineyard. We have noticed different degrees of sweetness in bunches from the same vine, as well as in bunches from different vines. When all are gathered on a certain day it is certain that all are not equally mature, and possibly none are as mature as they might be. Placing vineyards “under the ban” may be advantageous until we acquire more experience in determining the maturity of the fruit—at least every vine grower can put his own vineyard under his own ban, until by the processes which I have detailed he has ascertained that his fruit has acquired the maximum maturity; then his labor as a vine grower is completed, and his care should be transferred to the press and the cellar, where he will be rewarded for his skill and patience by having a rich juice capable of undergoing the subsequent processes, and producing a rich wine, without the accidents of the acetic, mucilaginous, or putrefactive fermentations. The joys of the vintage will not be turned into sorrow, nor the wine into vinegar. Rich juices alone can make wine, poor juices make vinegar; and he who can ferment a rich juice, is sure to make a rich, sound, and saleable wine.

Table of Specific Gravity and Acidity of Grape Juice observed at different dates during the Summer of 1860 — acidity computed in grains contained in one ounce of the juice.

DATE.		SP. GR.	GRS.
July 29	Warren, Sasportes, Charleston	1065	3.78
29	Black July, Yeadon, Kalmia	2.55
Aug. 1	Norton, Mayrant, Columbia	1077	3.66
1	Catawba, Augusta	1043	3.66
4	Warren, Thomson, Charleston	1057	4.11
4	Isabella, green, Columbia, } one bunch {	1040	6.73
4	Isabella, colored, Columbia, }	1059	2.82
	Warren, Dangerfield, green, Charleston	1048	4.05
	Black July, Chisolm, Charleston	1067	2.13
	Warren, Witpen, Charleston	1065	3.79
	Warren, Kalb, green, and fermented fourteen days	7.89
	Warren, Simons, green, and fermented fourteen days	7.75
	Warren, Dufort, Charleston	1070	3.96
	Warren, Columbia	1069	3.88
	Isabella, fermented for ten days	3.36
13	Norton, tincture, Columbia	1013	3.15
	Norton, second pressing from water	1002	1.21
	Norton; juice, with alcohol	1023
	Norton, tincture and second pressing mixed	1008
16	Warren, Sasportes, Charleston	1084	1.78
16	Black July, Chisolm, Charleston	1078	1.86
18	Catawba, Augusta	1080	1.26
18	Red Lenoir, Mayrant, Columbia	1092	3.43
	Norton, Mayrant, Columbia	1080	2.40
24	Catawba, Ravenel, Aiken	1083	0.82
	Isabella, purple, Ravenel, Aiken, } one bunch { ..	1090	0.49
	Isabella, green, Ravenel, Aiken, }	1057	2.35
	Blande's Madeira, Ravenel, Aiken	1078	0.69
	Warren, Mazyck, Aiken	1077	0.91
	Pauline, Mazyck, Aiken	1088	1.00
	Pauline, Mazyck, Aiken, another vine	1081	1.21
	Warren, Dudley, Orangeburgh	1070	1.17
26	Black July, Mazyck, Aiken	1096	1.56
	Blande's Madeira, Mazyck, Aiken	1087	1.57
	Isabella, Mazyck, Aiken	1076	1.45
	Catawba, Crowell, Bluffton	1085	2.34
	Catawba, Crowell, Bluffton	1090	1.57
30	Warren, Millar, Charleston	1069	1.36
	Catawba, Cook, Kaolin, near Aiken	1083	0.84
Sept. 9	Catawba, Cook, Kaolin, eleven days after plucking ..	1102	1.07
	Catawba, Cook, Kaolin, two days after plucking ..	1081	1.15
10	Blande's Madeira, Cook, Kaolin	1094	1.71
12	Scuppernong, Ravenel, Aiken	1073	1.12
15	Catawba, Cook, Kaolin	1088	1.18
	Black July, Cook, Kaolin	1108	2.19
	Warren, Cook, Kaolin	1097	1.84
16	Warren, Dangerfield, Charleston	1070	1.33

DATE.		SP. GR.	GRS.
Sept. 17	Little wild grape, Hammond, Redcliffe	1093
	Large wild grape, Hammond, Redcliffe	1059	2.37
	Green wild grape, Hammond, Redcliffe	1047	3.13
25	Catawba, Cook, sound	1089	1.65
	Catawba, Cook, rotting	1096	2.85
27	Blue grape from New York, called Isabella	1038	3.63
29	Catawba, New York	1060	3.69

N. B.—The specific gravities in the table above were taken at temperatures ranging between 80° and 90°, when the 1000-grain bottle was constructed for a temperature of 64°: hence a correction becomes necessary. The recorded numbers may be considered to be 3 grains below the true specific gravity, hence the addition of 3 will approximate the true specific gravity. When great accuracy is required, the instrument can be adjusted for each daily operation by filling the bottle with water at the temperature of the air and the juice, and making it equipoise by the addition or subtraction of weights to or from the counterpoise. It is manifest, if the instrument be true to water it must be also true to any other fluid whose specific gravity is required.

ON THE PRESERVATION OF GRAPE JUICE.

Our hopes and prospects thus far are founded upon the success of excavated cellars to moderate the ardor of an August sun, and secure a proper temperature to the fermenting juice, and upon the introduction and cultivation of later maturing varieties of grapes. But while these improvements are in progress, or in the event of their impracticability, we should seek out other plans by which the present condition of things may be ameliorated. I have clearly shown that the purely manufactured wines of Aiken are either too acid or too weak in spirits—that these defects proceed from immaturity of the grape, and from the high temperature of the must during fermentation. The high temperature induces two evils which are injurious to wine, viz: the loss of alcohol by its conversion into acetic acid, and its loss by more rapid evaporation during the exposure of fermentation. The presumed richness of the Catawba juice employed in the production of the Hammond wine of 1859, should have afforded more alcohol than the analysis exhibited. The difference of saccharine matter between the Rhenish and Catawba musts could not have been as great as the respective quantities of alcohol indicated; hence, some loss must have occurred somewhere, and this loss was most probably during fermentation by spontaneous evaporation. Ruin follows the removal of the cork from a bottle of the best French wine, not only by contact with air, exciting the acetic fermentation, but by the evaporation of the alcohol, and consequent loss of the preservative element of the whole compound. The antiseptic power of alcohol is well known, yet it might not have occurred to my readers to refer the preservation and durability of wine to the alcohol which it contains.

This fact becomes evident when we evaporate or distil off the alcohol from wine. It is no longer wine—the other constituents undergo changes, and putrefaction is the result. The term “boiled wines” is a misnomer; the wine when made is not boiled, it is the grape juice from which the wine is to be made that is boiled, in order to concentrate the sugar and produce a richer material to generate a greater quantity of alcohol. The strong, sweet wines of Spain are of this kind, in which the production of a determinate quantity of alcohol suspends the vinous fermentation and preserves the excess of sugar from further change. The due adjustment of the alcohol to the sugar and the antiseptic quality of the former preventing any further change in the latter, is the whole secret involved in the manufacture of the wines of Madeira, Xeres and Oporto; while the wines of France and Germany purport to be made from the unadulterated juice of the grape, as it comes from the vineyard. Such may be true, but there is a large consumption of brandy and starch sugar in the wine regions, which may be used to strengthen the wines which are to be exported to England and the United States. The employment of brandy and sugar to construct a good wine is notorious; and it may truly be said, if these materials are omitted, the wine is weak and acid, and not adapted to the English or American taste; but when they are skilfully “fretted in” and judiciously proportioned, we have a wine worthy of the highest laudation. The unrivalled Madeira, so esteemed in South Carolina, so early introduced—for Mr. Peter Purry commended its virtues in 1731—and so long continued as the favorite of the state, is a compound of this description. I have already shown that no natural grape juice ever contained the quantity of alcohol and sugar which is found in Madeira, sherry or port wine; hence, from whence was it derived? Simply by additions made to the must previous to fermentation, or to the wine after fermentation. Both practices are common; and so long as art can improve nature and produce such an article as “old Madeira,” the pure and unsophisticated wines of France and Germany will remain undesirable. Aiken may choose her own standard of wine. She can avoid both extremes. Neither make the weak and acid wines of France and Germany, nor yet the strong and sweet wines of Spain, Portugal and Italy. There is a medium which may suit all tastes, and that medium can be reached by science, by experiment, and by practice.

We can select methods from all the European wine makers, and adapt them to our circumstances, to our tastes, and to our habits. We are habitually an “ardent spirit” drinking people, and this habit can only be cured by substituting a more moderate and pleasanter beverage than whiskey or brandy. It is the alcohol of the wine or whiskey that charms the world; and acetic acid cannot be substituted for it even if be the fer-

mented juice of the grape. The conversion of grape juice into wine is an art, and he who can prepare the most palatable wine is considered to be the best and most successful artist, and the question is not whether he adds sugar to the recent must, or brandy to the weak, fermented wine—one or the other is done, and the amended wine is pronounced to be good; and no charge of adulteration has ever been sustained against the wine-houses of Funchal, where the last complement to the thirtieth gallon of brandy is added to each pipe of Madeira wine before it is considered worthy to sustain the reputation of the exporting house in a foreign market. That a great deal of this added brandy evaporates there is no question; but experience has taught the merchants that this quantity is requisite to supply deficiencies, and still to retain a sufficiency to secure durability to the wine. Adulteration implies something not only foreign, but injurious; and the world has never decided that sugar and brandy are either foreign or injurious to wine. They are the natural primary and secondary productions of the grape; and if one gallon of juice cannot furnish a sufficiency to make and preserve one gallon of wine, two gallons are used with the suppression of half of the water. A weak juice may be concentrated by boiling: that is, by removing half the water we virtually double the quantity of sugar; but there is an objection to the process, for with the water we abstract the aroma, and thus lose an important element in the composition of wine. By distilling an inferior wine we obtain not only the alcohol that was in the wine, but the aroma also; and if this be added to another wine, we concentrate in one portion the valuable constituents which were previously distributed through both. We accumulate what is valuable, and reject what is valueless. We make one good article out of two inferior ones, which under no construction of language can be called an adulteration. The Madeira wine drinkers scarcely know that in the consumption of one glass of wine they are consuming the constituents of three, and possibly four glasses of grape juice, less the water which has been removed; and yet it is expected that the normal juice of an Aiken grape can make a wine to compete with Madeira under the judgment of these amateurs.

The chemical compound alcohol has been brought into disrepute by the zealous labors of the temperance advocates. They have proclaimed its dangers, they have denounced it a poison, they have prohibited its use except for medical purposes. Has it no redeeming virtue—may not a temperate use prolong life and sustain health as well as restore health? Is there no difference between use and abuse? and cannot the world discriminate between them? Temperance in all things is commendable; but if a morbid appetite prevails, which too often does, temperance is overpowered and drunkenness rules. The abuse of alcohol is no argument against its moderate use, and cannot

be opposed to the authoritative advice of St. Paul, who recommends to Timothy to "drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." The attempt to substitute wine for whiskey is wise and laudable, and should not be opposed on the fancied hypothesis that alcohol is a poison in every form or quantity. The experience of the world has shown that wine is the most commendable form in which alcohol may be used, and practice has demonstrated that it is the most agreeable. The cost of wine has been a drawback to its use, and, so far, has been reserved to those in comfortable circumstances, while the more potent and dangerous whiskey has been the common drink of the poorer classes, accompanied with the high prerogative to dilute it or not, according to the morbidity of the taste or the progress of intoxication. The wine drinker does not enjoy so great a liberty; his alcohol is already diluted to the wholesome standard, and the only privilege that he enjoys is to dilute it still further, but he is debarred all power to make it stronger.

To construct or preserve a wine without a due proportion of alcohol is a natural impossibility. The alcohol is an essential element, without which it cannot be wine. Alcohol, brandy and wine only differ from each other in the quantity of water, sugar, essential oils and acids which are present or absent. Wine is the most complex, for it contains alcohol, sugar, essential oils, acids and water, to the amount of 80 to 90 per cent. Brandy, a corruption of the German Brantwein, that is distilled wine, contains alcohol, the essential oils, and water, to the amount of 47 to 50 per cent., while alcohol is presumed to be free from all essential oils or water. The relationship thus existing between wine and alcohol is seen to be so intimate that the removal of the alcohol destroys the wine, while the addition of alcohol makes the poorer wines rich, hence more costly and more in demand. The dread and aversion which modern lecturers have displayed against alcohol in every form of combination amounts to superstition and fanaticism, against which reason may labor in vain; we, therefore, propose to show that with its many acknowledged evils it has some virtues, and, like many other things, it is valuable to mankind when judiciously used and not inordinately abused.

Alcohol, like salt, is an antiseptic, and as such may be as valuable for some purposes as salt. During the fourteenth century the seaport towns of Europe enjoyed the luxury of fresh herrings, while the interior towns were deprived of them. Millions were daily caught, and millions daily spoiled. In this dilemma it occurred to one William Denkelzoon, a fisherman of Biervliet, in the then Flanders, to contrive a plan by which the herrings could be preserved. He experimented with salt, and perfectly succeeded at the close of the century. The result of this simple discovery was that, during the fifteenth century, preserved her-

rings were distributed all over Europe, and Holland still enjoys the reputation of producing "Dutch herrings," which are known in every market. The discovery of Denkelzoon called into requisition 3,000 vessels and 450,000 men, and was the foundation of the subsequent naval power of Holland. So much for a preservative to so insignificant an article as a "dead herring." What would be the porcine wealth of the Western states without the knowledge of the Dutch fisherman's discovery? It is true that the art of smoking herrings was a subsequent discovery by an unknown citizen of Dieppe, in France. Yet the knowledge of the two processes of salting and smoking has enabled the Western states to send "Cincinnati bacon" all over the world without apprehension of loss, and it stands in the remotest regions side by side with the pickled and smoked herrings of Holland. The preservative power of salt and smoke over fish and flesh has produced an influence in the world that few imagine. It has equalized soil and climate through the medium of commerce. It has distributed the excess of production to the mutual advantage of the consumer and producer, and increased production to correspond to the increased consumption.

The story of Denkelzoon contains a moral which is applicable to Aiken. There may be produced there any quantity of grape juice in the months of August of each successive year, and, like the herrings of Holland, is incapable of preservation. Salting and smoking is inapplicable to grape juice. The Dutch discovery is then of no value; but the principle of preservation suggests a substitute for salt and smoke—and this substitute is the much abused alcohol. It is as efficient in its preservative powers as salt, and is easily removed when its services are no longer required. In this respect it is superior to salt and smoke, for they combine so intimately with the fish and flesh that the separation is impossible. He would be an equal benefactor to mankind who would teach us how to restore salted viands to their original freshness. Yet the same end has been accomplished by a method of preservation which obviates the use of salt. It is founded on the fact that putrefaction cannot commence or proceed except in the presence of the oxygen of the air; and if this be excluded by sealing the material to be preserved in tin cases, the end is perfectly accomplished. Examples of this mode of preservation are familiar to all house-keepers who indulge in the luxuries of distant climates in the forms of salmon, lobsters, tomatoes, etc.

The application of this plan of preservation is obviously impracticable to grape juice, in consequence of the expense and delicacy of the operation of sealing. There then remains but one plan by which the August grape juice can be preserved until winter, or for any indefinite period, and that is by calling into requisition the antiseptic properties of alcohol. We apply

the principle of Denkelzoon in the selection of a more appropriate article than salt, and have every expectation that the use of alcohol, in preserving the juices of fruit for transportation and distribution, will effect the same beneficial ends in these Southern states that the preservation of herrings has effected in Holland. By its use, we conquer the disability of climate and the frailty of the fruit. If nature has designed the grape to grow, and come to its highest perfection in a warm climate, and has also ordained that vinous fermentation can only be safely conducted in a cool one, we have the power, by the aid of the antiseptic properties of alcohol, safely to transport the preserved juice to a more northern region for fermentation, or to retain it at home until the genial winter comes to us and brings with it a temperature suitable to our necessities. Until we can alter the course of nature, it is wise to alter our plans to suit the course of nature. If the high temperature of August prohibits the manufacture of wine in Aiken, and the use of alcohol enables us to preserve the juice for transportation to New York or Cincinnati, where it can be immediately sold; or, still better, to keep it in our frame houses until winter, when it can be fermented, we certainly owe a debt of gratitude to alcohol, and must acknowledge that it possesses one virtue, even if that one be linked with ten thousand vices. That alcohol possesses this property is now no longer a question. I have in my possession grape and pineapple juices which are now more than one year old, and are still perfect. The original sugar still remains unchanged in these juices, and the added alcohol has played the same preservative part that the alcohol produced by the fermentation of the sugar would have done, had the fermentation been allowed under favorable circumstances. It is truly an extemporaneous wine, in which the alcohol of starch sugar has been substituted for the alcohol of grape sugar, and the grape sugar remains unimpaired for any future use to which it may be directed, either to continue to sweeten the compound, or to strengthen it by its subsequent conversion into alcohol. If the preservative power of all wine is derived from the alcohol it contains, it was certainly not an exercise of extraordinary genius to predict that the addition of alcohol to grape juice would preserve it, for it was nothing more than the conversion of grape juice into wine, by supplying the deficiency that the absence of fermentation had left vacant. That the principle was not before applied to grape juice is probably owing to the common impression that wine is produced, not made by human hands or human skill; that it would be sacrilege to mix the base alcohol—the devil's own handiwork—as an ingredient of the Lord's anointed wine; that the mysterious process of fermentation is dispensed with, and the compound thus made cannot be wine, for it does not accord with the definition as set down in the dictionaries.

Alcohol is alleged to be made from grain, which has no affinity, relationship or similarity to the grape; hence, grape juice strengthened with alcohol is not wine, physically nor chemically; it is the abominable alcohol diluted with sweet grape juice, and as such should not be patronized nor consumed by a temperate people, when we can obtain the legitimate wine from those regions where, with the blessing of God and the experience of the people, the genuine article is produced, and contains no other element than what originally existed in the grape. The expression of such views are common, and the tendency is to discourage all endeavors to produce a purer wine than any which is imported. Can there be any possible difference between wines which are brandied abroad and those which are whiskied at home, except in the difference of flavor? Can there be any difference between brandy and whiskey, except in the flavoring material? The same quantity of alcohol is the foundation of both, which in one case is derived from the sugar of the grape, and in the other from the sugar of the grain. These sugars are so identical in their composition, that they go under the common names of grape sugar, fruit sugar, or starch sugar, and can be made and are made to supply each other whenever occasion demands. The manufacture of starch sugar is carried on extensively in Europe to supply the saccharinal deficiency of the grape, both in the production of wine and brandy; hence, all solicitude about the adulteration of the grape by the grain is imaginary and futile. The brandy is added to the wine to obtain the benefit of the alcohol which it contains. I propose to add the alcohol directly; and if this alcohol be freed from its dangerous and disagreeable essential oils, we have a purer article than brandy or whiskey, and certainly a cheaper material. The object and intention of adding alcohol to recent grape juice is to preserve it through the months of August, September and October unchanged by fermentation. During the month of November, the cold weather is sufficiently established and continuous in Aiken to conduct the vinous fermentation without the apprehension of the acetic; hence wine, not vinegar, can then be made. As the wine is not to be immediately made, the anxiety for an early and untimely vintage will not exist. The grapes may be allowed to come to full maturity, and they may be gathered in any quantity as they perfectly mature. No determinate quantity is daily requisite to fill a vat or cask; any quantity may be put into any cask, without the necessity of filling it. The casks may be daily or weekly opened to receive additional quantities, without any danger of destruction. The function of fermentation is completely suspended, and it will endure as long in this condition as if the fermentation had been accomplished and the wine actually made according to the definition. Chemically, the wine is made; but according to the taste of the people,

vitiated by the use of the strong or acid wines of Europe, it is decided to be too sweet. The labor and patience of the wine grower to accumulate the greatest quantity of sugar and to get rid of the greatest quantity of acid, is lost. We have only changed an acid wine for a sweet one, except that we have changed a wine that could not be drank for one which can be relished by some, especially the ladies, who, being sweet themselves, can appreciate sweetness in other things, and to their care and patronage I commit the destiny of the sweet wine, which can so easily and certainly be made from every garden vine in the state. For the sterner sex, this sweetness must be removed, and strength substituted—in other words, we must transform the native sugar into alcohol by the subsequently-induced process of vinous fermentation. Thus, from the grapes of the same vine, we may make a wine to suit both husband and wife, and thus restore the harmony that is occasionally interrupted in consequence of diversity of taste: one preferring the strong, the other the sweet; one refusing to purchase the sweet, the other refusing to drink the strong.

When a vine is held as common property, and the wife knows her rights and dares to maintain them, some sweet wine will be reserved for her use; and if this be doubted, the process is so simple that she can secure her share of the fruit, manufacture her own wine, and preserve it safely for herself and friends. I know a case in Charleston where the wife took possession of the whole arbor, and converted its produce into sweet wine to the amount of thirteen gallons, which the husband relishes as well as she does. Her previous attempts to make wine on the European plan universally failed and ended in vinegar; now she rejoices that she has found a use for a grape vine, and intends hereafter to manufacture all her own wine. A Frenchman of this city, who was possessor of some celebrated imported vines, as he believed, and had often failed to produce a wine, resolved to try my process, as published in the *Courier* of the 10th March, 1860. Being a working man, he could only devote the evening to the experiment, so he gathered his ripest bunches, then gathered his family and set all hands to detach the grapes from the stems, in which operation the children were efficient; he then provided a tub and log of wood, with which the grapes were mashed; the elder members of the family were furnished with towels, through which the juice was squeezed and deposited in another tub. When the mechanical processes were over, the juice was measured and found to be eight gallons; one gallon of good alcohol was added, and the contents were distributed in bottles equal to nine gallons of wine—forty-five bottles. This compound has suffered no fermentation nor deterioration of any kind, and the manufacturer is happy and proud to offer his "*vin de liqueur*" to any one who desires a glass or two. The skins and pulp demanded his

next attention. Did he give these to the cow? Oh, no; the flavor, the coloring matter, and some portion of the acid and sugar were contained in the skins and pulp, and they were to be preserved for future use, hence he placed the mare, as it is called by wine makers, into large-mouthed jars and bottles, covered it with equal portions of alcohol and water, previously mixed, and closely covered them with large corks and put them away. What future uses will be made of it will hereafter appear, for there are many, and it is difficult to say what is the best. Suffice it to say for the present, that after the expiration of fourteen or more days the mare may be removed from the jars and submitted to pressure with the towel or otherwise. The clear liquid which is obtained may be placed in bottles, together with some water, which has been used to drench and rinse the mare after pressure. This liquid, which I have called the tincture of the grape, on tasting will be found to be high-flavored and strong, and, perhaps, sufficiently sweet for many tastes. If not, an addition of some of the preserved juice supplies this defect. If too strong, a little water corrects that evil. In fact, it can be adjusted according to taste, simply by measuring proportions and tasting, and when we are suited, prepare a quantity for future use according to those proportions. I have found that three parts of tincture are sufficiently sweetened by one part of juice, and forms a better beverage than either the preserved juice or the tincture. The whole process of preservation may be simplified, but not improved, by digesting the mare and must together, with about one-fifth of its volume of alcohol; after the advent of cool weather, it may be strained, pressed, washed, and pressed again, and a rich juice will be obtained, suitable to any subsequent purpose to which it may be designed. If designed for immediate use, the delay for cool weather is unnecessary. The advantage gained is the omission of one pressure, and the disadvantage is a greater number of large-mouthed vessels which will be required, with the corresponding difficulties of keeping them tight, if not made expressly for the purpose; however, domestic ingenuity, I trust, will overcome all these difficulties.

ART. VIII.—THE COTTON INTEREST, AND ITS RELATION TO THE PRESENT CRISIS.

Having an abiding faith in the potent influence of "King Cotton," the writer is free to confess that he had anticipated an earlier movement on behalf of England and France, as the powers most largely interested, looking to the supplying of their manufactories, before the effect of a diminishing stock

should have so materially enhanced the value, to say nothing of the political results likely to follow the curtailment of labor. Certainly, the "Cotton Supply Association" had never before so good an opportunity of pressing upon the government their claims to attention and support, and, viewing the subject from their stand-point, their efforts are commendable enough. But we cannot for a moment believe that the shrewd and far-seeing statesmen and merchants of England entertained any expectation of supplying the immediate demand for raw cotton outside of the Southern Confederacy. The combined power and wealth of Great Britain could not accomplish it, if silly enough to make the attempt.

Under the stimulus of a pressing necessity and high prices, and by diverting from the Chinese market part of its usual supply, about 988,000 bales have been drawn from India, equal in weight to about 750,000 bales of American, and greatly deficient in quality. We venture the prediction, that so much will not be received from the same source in 1862.

Notwithstanding these powerful influences, the supply received from Egypt and Brazil was ten per cent. less in 1861 than the year before. The receipts at Liverpool from Africa were 1,600 bales in 1860, and only 1,300 in 1861. From the West Indies 5,500 bales in 1860, and 6,500 in 1861.

The time will undoubtedly come when, from various parts of the world, a larger supply of raw cotton will be derived; but, in the meantime, the demand will have increased in a larger ratio. Commerce is the hand-maiden of civilization; and the wild or ignorant tribes who may hereafter become the producers of cotton, will become consumers of the manufactured article.

We must look for other grounds on which to account for the long-delayed action of foreign governments. It seems very clear that, what with the old and deep-rooted prejudice against slavery, the double fact that the South was deprived of all postal and commercial intercourse with other nations, and that all that was known about us abroad was derived from the most false, malignant and debased press in the world, prompted by the most corrupt and venal government that ever disgraced a professedly civilized country, if we could get behind the scenes of the state departments on this and the other side of the Atlantic, we should probably find Jonathan pledging himself to John to do that which he knew to be impossible, and the latter believing him for want of better information. When, however, the British government and people awoke to a knowledge of the facts as they really existed, both interest and sympathy inclined them toward the South. Finding, however, that to do that which interest and sympathy, rather than inclination, prompted, it must come in conflict with an unprincipled government, and a reckless and infuriated mob to back it, the

English government found it necessary to take some little time for preparation. We can already see the "beginning of the end;" but there seems little doubt that if our great Southern king had not interposed, and compelled them to respect his silvery locks, the governments of Europe would have left us alone to fight it out. Six months ago the South had no friends, and now the North has none. We have bought our new friends, let us hereafter compel them to respect us; we can hold them only by the ties of interest and of fear.

Much has been said and written about the policy of curtailing the growth of cotton, for the purpose of enhancing its value, or making other nations feel the want of that for which they *professed* to care so little.

Nothing could be more impolitic; and any legislative or conventional action looking to this end, is simply absurd. While we admit the fact, that years must elapse, before any very material addition can be made to the production of other countries, especially of quantities analagous to New Orleans cotton, still, there is no reason why we should force the wealth and enterprise of England and France, to test their utmost ability in this direction. It is clearly for our interest to supply the general demand, at a fair and remunerative price. So long as we do this, we defy competition and hold all Europe at our feet. It would be neither neighborly nor politic to flaunt defiance in the face of the world; though the cord that binds be never so strong, let it be so finely drawn as not to attract observation.

While every article of staple food should be raised at home, and coarse fabrics of cotton and wool, shoes, implements of husbandry, and the heavier work of cast and wrought iron should be manufactured in the Southern Confederacy; still, for all goods requiring cheap labor and careful manipulation, especially when the material is the product of other countries, we should go into the markets of the world, where the products of our soil would be gladly received in exchange. We are as essential an agricultural as Great Britain is a manufacturing and maritime nation. Commercial reciprocity is the surest basis of permanent peace and national prosperity.

Notwithstanding the antagonism of feeling, race and character, the North and South would yet be united, had not the former lost sight of this fundamental truth, and sought by coercion to obtain from us what they were not willing to grant in return.

We have frequently been inquired of by planters. "What would you recommend us to do as regards preparing to grow another crop?" The reply has uniformly been: make, first, all you can possibly for your own use, both of food and clothing; and in addition, as *much cotton as you conveniently can*.

Under the existing state of the country, and with the expe-

rience of the past four years pressing so severely upon the attention of planters, there is no probability that more cotton will be raised the coming year than will find a ready market. In all the northern portion of the cotton belt, grain will take very largely the place of cotton, for the present; while over the whole country, more or less labor will be diverted into other channels. On the supposition that, of the past crop, 3,500,000 bales will be available so soon as the blockade is raised, and that 3,000,000 will be grown the coming season, we have, then, for two years use.....6,500,000
 add total stock in Europe, 1st January last.....1,000,000
 add product of other countries, two years.....2,000,000

we have supply for two years, say.....9,500,000
 bales on a broad basis of calculation.

The actual amount taken for consumption during 1859 and 1860 was 9,525,000 bales; during which time the amount produced by other countries than the United States was but 1,705,000, or 300,000 less than the very liberal estimate made for this and next year.

The present offers an excellent opportunity for cotton planters to turn more attention to spinning and weaving, when they have the means. To repair fences, dwellings, gin-houses, negro quarters; clear out their ditches, etc. All such needful work has been more or less overlooked during the speculative excitement of the past few years. The great crop of 1859-60 was made too much at the expense of corn, etc., the scarcity of which has had so important a share in bringing about the large indebtedness of the planting community—the Providential influence of drought had not all to do with it. If the course indicated above be carried out, we shall then be in a position in 1863 to raise such a crop of cotton as the wants of the world may demand: the independence of the Southern Confederacy and unrestricted trade with Europe being considered a foregone conclusion.

The tables which follow give, first—the supply from the different parts of the world for eight years; underneath which will be found the average price of Middling Cotton in New Orleans for thirty-two weeks of the year, during which the bulk of the crop is sold, the number of bales received during the month of August, and date of killing frost in each year. The second table gives the consumption of the different portions of the world for the same period. Both the consumption and production of the past year are estimated, excepting of the United States—our tables being made up to the 1st of September, while in Europe they are made up to 1st of January ensuing. About 195,000 bales, raised in this country, are consumed in the interior factories, and, not being shipped to any port, are not included in either table.

SUPPLY IN EUROPE AND UNITED STATES.

	1860-61.	1859-60.	1858-59.	1857-58.	1856-57.	1855-56.	1854-55.	1853-54.
United States.....	3,700,000	4,676,000	3,851,500	3,114,000	2,939,500	3,528,000	2,847,500	2,930,000
East Indies.....		573,000	514,000	460,000	738,000	472,000	393,000	308,000
Brazil		106,000	130,000	126,000	190,000	158,000	165,000	140,000
Egypt	1,250,000	158,000	149,000	157,000	130,000	182,000	194,000	160,000
West Indies.....		47,000	30,000	34,000	38,000	31,000	31,000	22,000
Total	4,950,000	5,560,000	4,674,500	3,891,000	4,035,500	4,371,000	3,630,500	3,560,000
Av. p'ce Mid. in N.O.	11	10 $\frac{7}{8}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	12 $\frac{5}{8}$	9 $\frac{1}{4}$	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 $\frac{5}{8}$
Bales n. c. to Sept. 1.	36,670	9,698	4,834	33	1,166	23,282	1,391	74
Date of killing frost.	Oct. 15.	Oct. 30.	Nov. 16.	Nov. 10.	Oct. 8.	Oct. 24.	Nov. 14.	Oct. 25.

CONSUMPTION OF EUROPE AND UNITED STATES.

Great Britain.....	2,390,000	2,633,000	2,294,000	2,175,000	1,961,000	2,264,000	2,099,000	1,967,000
United States.....	650,000	792,000	760,000	452,000	702,000	653,000	594,000	611,000
France	630,000	621,000	525,000	517,000	447,000	526,000	479,000	423,000
Holland & Belgium			189,000	154,000	155,000	179,000	152,000	161,000
Spain			118,000	112,000	90,000	122,000	114,000	97,000
Germ'y. Baltic, etc.	1,400,000	1,067,000	406,000	420,000	296,000	391,000	329,000	
Trieste and Genoa			119,000	138,000	130,000	158,000	143,000	425,000
Total	5,070,000	5,113,000	4,411,000	3,968,000	3,781,000	4,290,000	3,910,000	2,684,000

In allusion to the above tables it is proper to state that, at the close of 1860, English spinners were known to hold more than 100,000 bales in excess of what they had a year before, so that the actual consumption was only 2,530,000 bales; and, inasmuch as at the latest date they held less by about 130,000 than at the opening of the year, the actual amount used in 1861 will be about 2,520,000 bales, or thereabouts; thus, the annual quantity manufactured will not present so wide a difference.

On the 1st of January, 1861, the continental manufacturers were said to hold 150,000 bales more than usual, yet the combined export to the continent during 1861, from this country and England, was fully as large as the year before; at the same time, we are given to understand that they are now no better supplied with stock relatively than in England. If this be true, there has been an increase rather than falling off in continental manufactures.

Neither the annual statements from Great Britain or the continent are yet at hand. The latest reliable accounts from Liverpool are to the 27th of December, and giving the business of that port only. The amount taken for consumption was 2,180,000 bales, against 2,526,000 the year before—a difference of only 346,000, notwithstanding the high prices—while spinners only held about 70,000 bales, against 183,000 a year ago. The stock on hand was of all sorts 558,700 packages, of which only 216,000 were American, with about 70,000 bales only known to be afloat from India, Brazil and Egypt. During the

first seven months of the year, nearly 51,000 bales per week were taken for consumption and 13,000 bales for export, say in all 64,000. At present, about 32,000 are being bought for home use and 8,000 for the continent, say in all 40,000 bales. At this rate and allowing 150,000 for import, the entire supply will be exhausted by the first of May. Another important fact must not be overlooked, namely: that the proportion of American cotton used per month is 5-7ths, or 5,000 bales, against 2,000 of other sorts, so far as home consumption is concerned; of the exports, about 2-5ths are American. On this basis of calculation, it would seem that the supply of American cannot last beyond the first week of March, without allowing a bale for export; though, by a further curtailment of time, the final stoppage of machinery may be postponed to April. The holders of the debris of the dusty crops of 1858 and 1859, will be able to dispose of it at a handsome profit; such as could not be sold at three pence, will now realize perhaps eight.

On the supposition that the blockade were raised on the first of March even, cotton could not go forward fast enough even by steamers to meet immediately pressing wants; the *London Economist* of January 4th, estimates the amount from India, Brazil, etc., to be received by the end of June, at only 300,000 bales—it is always the case that the largest receipts from those sources come to hand during the fall months.

This is a state of things sufficiently embarrassing and critical, so far as other nations are concerned, and cannot possibly be of long continuance. In the absence of positive information, we may infer either that under the combined demand of England and France, backed by the presence of a fleet, for the fulfilment of treaty obligations, the government at Washington will raise the blockade, perhaps by the time this appears in print, or that the combined powers will do it by force at a very early day—the former seems most probable.

Though the value of cotton may be kept up to a high figure for some months to come on the other side of the water, still, so soon as the first shipments are at hand, there must be a gradual decline till middlings get down to about 9d., below which they are not likely to go so long as there is any disturbance of commercial relations, and consequent uncertainty as to the future supply.

On this side, many circumstances will combine against the value of cotton; though prices may be good they are not likely to be very high, because so soon as trade opens the supply will be continuous up to the summer of 1863; freights, insurance and exchange, will all be against us. If the ports were now open, the crop lately gathered could not be brought to market before the next would be forthcoming; the railroads would be fully occupied, but, so far as the Mississippi valley is concerned, there are not steamboats enough available, even if the interior

rivers should keep up. On the waters of Alabama the war has not reduced the tonnage very materially, and a larger proportion would come to market before summer. As regards the crops of Texas, upper Red river, Arkansas, Washita and Yazoo, as well as the bayous of Louisiana, a large quantity will necessarily lie over till next winter. No accumulation of stock can occur at the ports, as the receipts will be taken off as fast as they come to hand.

The crop of 1861 will be good in staple, but a large portion low in quality in other respects, as the result of rainy weather during the earlier picking season, the extensive prevalence of rot, the injury done by worms in dusting the pods with excrement and fragments of leaf, less care than usual in gathering, and the injury resulting from housing so much in pens and sheds in the fields. Up to the middle of August, the prospects were favorable, but from that period to the first week in October, the rains were general and constant, causing too much growth of weed, and the loss by rotting and shedding of a large portion of the bottom and middle crop. The good picking weather in October and November, fortunate as it was, fell very far short of compensating for the loss during the earlier part of the season; and but for the long, open fall, three millions of bales could not have been gathered, as it turned out the old hills have this year yielded the best, and the low, rich lands the poorest crops, especially in the extreme South, where the caterpillar did very extensive damage. The diversion of land from cotton to grain, in the northern portion of the Confederacy, was of itself greatly instrumental in reducing the aggregate yield in 1861; during the present year, the same will be, to some extent, the case everywhere; but in Texas, and all the northern part of the cotton-growing states, the crop planted will be very much smaller than last year; and should the season not be very favorable, it is scarcely possible that three millions of bales will be raised.

Since the foregoing was written, later accounts are at hand, showing the stock actually in Liverpool the 1st of January to have been 623,000 bales, or about 80,000 more than was expected—the increase being chiefly in American descriptions; this, at 40,000 bales per week for consumption and export, would be consumed by the 20th of April. Only about 80,000 bales were known to be afloat to arrive by April, which will give two more weeks supply. *These facts are extracted from a private letter.* The receipts from other sources than the United States the first four months of 1860 were 350,000 bales, and much larger last year. This bears out the opinion before expressed, that the East India supply has been exhausted. Without having access to an annual Liverpool statement, we have published accounts said to have come from that source, to the effect that the consumption of Great Britain in 1861 was

2,391,000 bales, and of the continent of Europe 2,030,000. If this be correct, the increase in the amount manufactured on the continent is much greater than we were justified in predicting. The tables above have been made to correspond as nearly as possible. "King Cotton" holds the balance of power, and will make his influence felt.

If the published accounts of the large consumption of continental Europe prove to be correct, the raw material there must be almost entirely exhausted. The English consumption was nearly equal to that of 1860, notwithstanding the enhanced value of the raw material; so that we may infer not only that the pressure upon foreign governments will compel them to get cotton by some means before summer, but that high prices must continue to rule for some time to come.

ART. IX.—MORAL AND NATURAL LAW CONTRADISTINGUISHED.

There is not a relation in social life that is not intimately connected with the philosophy which distinguishes moral from natural government.

The great Dr. Samuel Johnson remarked, that naturally all men were dishonest, but that they were honest from education. Why did he discriminate between nature and education?

Can education alter the disposition by nature, *i. e.*, change the nature of the human disposition? If it can, it must be by the use and employment of some principle or agency other than the natural, and that must be moral principle. If we can alter and change the disposition given by nature, by the use and employment of moral principles, the two of themselves can neither be identical or harmonious. Moral principles must answer a *better* purpose than nature and her disposition of the character, or they would not be *preferred* in human education.

Is it natural for men to marry? We say it is not. Men are *educated to prefer it*. Nature points to unrestrained indulgence. The marriage relation is under the government of moral restraints. Nature is not. Let us, therefore, carefully distinguish between nature and the right. The slavery relation is also affected by this philosophy. How often is it declared by its enemies that slavery is an *unnatural* thing—a thing opposed to nature—contrary to natural rights—in opposition to the laws of nature. Now, is it wrong to oppose nature? Let us inquire. Certainly it is not to be denied, that unless justice be a law of nature, the term *natural justice* must be an unphilosophical term.

If any action be wrong—if slavery be wrong, must it not be

so because of the violation of some rule of right distinct from the promptings of nature? Must it not be because of the violation of some *moral* principle? Suppose nature prompts in one direction and morals in another, can they be regarded as in harmony? If not, wherein is the discord?

We affirm, without the fear of contradiction, that injustice, and wrong, and oppression, and cruelty, and all unkindness, uniformly and universally characterize the works of nature in all her departments. If this be so, and what sane man will deny it? can it be regarded as necessarily right to act in harmony with nature, or necessarily wrong vehemently to oppose her? If wrong and oppression characterize the works of nature in all her departments, how can we escape the conclusion that institutions, characterized by wrong and oppression, are right, because in harmony with the disposition of nature. Let nature be the standard of right, and let it be conceded that wrong and cruelty prevail in her departments, then, the conclusion is unavoidable, that institutions founded on wrong and cruelty are right, because in conformity with this assumed test of truth. We must come to better conclusions than this. If it be even right to oppose nature—to act in opposition to natural law—how do we know but that the opposition between slavery and the laws of nature may be the very strongest argument in defense of it?

If nature is not a source of morals, but, on the contrary, is in a state of moral ruin, we should not affirm of any moral law—any principle of right—that it is either natural or unnatural.

There have been in the world's history but one class of persons who have acted in an unnatural manner, and these have been Christ, and the apostles, and patriarchs.

To act unnaturally, is to act contrary to a law of nature. To perform a miracle, is to act contrary to a law of nature.

This being so, then, to say that slaveholders act unnaturally when they hold Africans in servile bonds, is to ascribe miraculous powers to them.

We must bear in mind that *all* power of action or motion, when that motion is the object of the human senses—or, in other words, is physical, comes from, proximately, nature.

If, now, A murders B, the power so to murder comes from nature, and the act is natural, and hence not miraculous—A uses the power of nature. Would there not be an obvious contradiction in saying that nature imparted all the power possessed by A when he murdered B, and at the same time say that A acted in opposition to nature, or that he performed an unnatural act?

If to act unnaturally means to act in opposition to the laws of nature then, when the Saviour of men raised Lazarus from the dead did he not perform an unnatural act? Surely.

This question forms the very ground of dispute between Hume and the sceptics on the one hand, and all Christian believers on the other. What is Hume's argument?

He maintains that all men who make reason the ground of their beliefs, should rather credit implicitly the consistency of nature than credit a miracle. And why? Because, as he contended, human testimony, proving an act in opposition to the laws of nature, is much less to be relied on than the fixedness and predominancy of natural laws.

Logic is an inexorable thing, and if, now, no human being can violate a law of nature, or postpone its operation, unaided by a divine or supernatural power, then it is an utter confusion of language—an utter departure from philosophical propriety of thought, to accuse slaveholders of acting contrary to natural right, or natural justice, or of opposing any natural law, when they hold Africans in bondage.

There are no such things as *natural right*. These words are self-contradictory and absurd: There are, we admit, rights that appertain to man. There are rules of right conduct regulating the social state, but nature, in all her departments, has nothing to do with them.

There are rights appertaining to every relation in social life, whether private or political. These private and these political rights repose on principles of *moral government*. What has nature to do with moral government? Nothing. And why? Plainly, because *nature is an effect*. What is nature? It is one of the creations of God. *It is matter under laws of motion or development.*

We know of the existence of but two distinct and different creations that have emanated from the Divine hand, and they are the natural and the spiritual; the material and immortal, the visible and the thinking, the unintelligent and the intelligent. Now, natural laws regulate the one, and moral laws are designed to regulate the other. Natural beings are visible and tangible, and are *under law*—fully and completely *governed by it*—hence it is that nature is, as Hume contended, so uniform and consistent. We may hence rely with the utmost confidence in the operations of nature. Hence any successful opposition to nature, or to natural uniformity and consistency, must come from a power greater than the power exhibited in nature. That power is the divine: for God is not only the author of nature, but also the author of the principles of moral propriety that are independent of nature, and exist apart from her operations. Whoever says God and nature are the same, then, they must confound moral and natural government. The reason for their conduct is very plain. If there be no distinction between God and nature, as M. Compté and others think, then God's laws and nature's laws are identical, and hence there can be no

moral principles that are not naturally displayed that may not be ascertained from the study of natural works and operations.

But how are moral laws ascertained, and with what consistency and uniformity are they obeyed? These are pregnant questions, and deserve a careful answer.

We ascertain moral principles from the study of no natural or visible object.

We ascertain moral principles from the study of the social life of intelligent beings, and the means and measure of social happiness.

Any principle regulating the social relation of intelligent, immortal, thinking beings, whose use and observance in the social state adorns and benefits that state, is a rule of morals.

But the knowledge of the majority of the principles of social life and social well-being, we learn from Revelation—a standard aside from nature. With what consistency and uniformity are moral principles obeyed? None whatever.

We all know that men are free agents in respect to rules of moral conduct, and obey them, or *refuse to obey them*, just as they choose. Hence we have good men, and bad men; the good being those who choose to obey moral law, and the bad those who refuse. Hence, there is no uniformity of obedience. How different from nature!

This want of uniformity shows the wide distinction between the objects of moral and those of natural law.

The objects of *natural laws uniformly and consistently obey* those laws, while men—while intelligent, thinking beings, who are the sole objects of moral, obey sometimes, and sometimes refuse. A natural object never refuses, because it has no freedom of volition. Hence, a free agent is not a *natural being*.

While we affirm that there is no sense in the term *natural right* or *natural justice*, we insist there is such a thing as natural liberty. Natural liberty includes the freedom of voluntary agents. Hence, it means that men may be either good or bad.

So far as moral government is concerned, men have the natural freedom either to obey or disobey it.

Thou shalt not kill, is a rule in morals; thou shalt not steal, is another. Men are, by nature, free to obey or disobey them as they choose. While in this free state by nature, moral government steps in and institutes obligation. Hence, moral obligation. Hence, we are morally obliged and naturally free. We are, first, free agents; and then, when we arrive at years of accountability, and come to apprehend the force and effect of moral principles, we come under obligation of obedience—an obligation that limits and restrains, while it does not destroy, natural freedom.

A is free, by nature, to kill B. But God comes to A, with the code of morals, and restrains his freedom, and *morally*

obliges him not to kill. Slaves are free agents, and hence have the natural liberty of killing their masters. But morally they are bound, not to kill, but to respectful obedience and submission.

Some men, who find fault with the institution of domestic bondage, allege, as an argument against it, that we deprive our slaves of their natural liberties.

Of course we do. We could not otherwise morally govern them. There never yet existed a moral rule of government, which did not abridge the natural free agency of man.* We do not deny that our slaves have the liberty to kill, and we do not deny that we abridge their freedom of action in that regard, by the principles of government to which we reduce them.

There never yet existed a man who had intelligence or understanding, whose natural freedom, whose natural liberty, God did abridge, who was, by Him, brought under obligation to behave properly in the relations of social life. Consistently with moral government, this abridgment of natural liberty is unavoidable. The very first step taken by any law-giver, whether divine or human, is an infringement of human liberty.

What is moral government based on? Manifestly, on the liberty of the agent about to be brought under its obligation. How can you oblige an agent morally, who has no freedom of choice? How can you tell a man to behave properly in the relations of social life, unless you know he has the power to obey or disobey. If he cannot do otherwise than obey, then your telling him to obey is breath foolishly expended.

If he *can* disobey, then that is his freedom of action.

But why is man's free agency called his natural liberty? It is so called, and properly so called, because he derives his power of action or motion from his natural organization, which is purely the product of nature. Man, as a free being, and his organization are different. All organization comes from nature, for nature has to do with matter, and nothing but matter can be organized. The power that thinks is immaterial. We are, as intelligent and immaterial beings, indebted to the physical strength of our material bodies for the liberty of manifestation. Our bodies, our physical outworks, are the products of nature, and nature imparts strength to them in strict obedience of uniform and consistent natural laws. It is to this physical strength that we resort when we wish to act, and we resort to it alike whether we choose to be either good or bad—to do a praiseworthy or a criminal act.

A resorts to his natural strength when he proceeds to kill, and resorts to the same natural endowments when he wishes to do a good act. Hence, for free agency, we are indebted to our nature; and hence our freedom of agency is called our natural liberty. License is its proper name. There is no such thing as

moral freedom or moral liberty. The freedom of man is always and invariably natural, while his *obligation* is always moral.

Moral rule and moral obligation are convertible terms, while freedom and free agency mean the same. Hence, freedom of itself is never moral. It only becomes moral when the divine being restrains it. The law of restraint thus emanating, constitutes the code of morals. There can be no morals in the absence of law, and hence no civil security with unrestrained natural freedom or license. This whole question lies at the basis of the great science of civil government. Civil government reposes on the rights of man, and the rights of man on the restraints of moral government.

Natural freedom comes first, moral government comes secondly, and then, thirdly, comes civil or human rule; and this latter rule is only true or wise in proportion as it happens to accord with the higher code—the higher code being those principles that prevail in the relations of social life; that traces their origin to the *divine* wisdom.

God has regulated (that is to say, has instituted rules of proper deportment for) all the relations of social life, whether we know and act on them or not. There may be rules of conduct for some of the relations of social life that society may not apprehend and act on for a thousand years to come. But they are existing, and have existed from the beginning. What was true of the social state of man in the dawn of social intercourse is true now; and will continue to be the highest wisdom applicable to that state so long as there shall be such a thing as social intercourse on earth. No matter how ignorant man may be of it, no matter how he may live in disregard of it, it will ever be his highest rule of conduct, for, as God's will, it is ever consistent.

While we admit the possibility, nay, the certainty, of a conflict between human and divine rules of social or civil government, we have no hesitancy in deciding as to the duty of the citizen.

Practically, no man should set up his private judgment as a rule for his conduct, in opposition to the civil authority, or any legitimate branch of it. This is the general rule, to which there is an exception in the case of revolutions.

We do not wish to be understood as holding that a citizen must fail to express his repugnance to a rule of the civil authority violative, in his judgment, of the divine authority, but that his opposition must be in harmony with and promotive of the security of civil government. If a conscientiously believes a certain civil rule to be in opposition to the law of God, it is his duty to submit to it practically, at the same time opposing it theoretically—the latter opposition to be always under the government of Christian principles, that is to say, always conducted under action in harmony with the public peace. Strife

is not to be sought, neither is it to be avoided. The line of demarcation between obedience and resistance, though of difficult practical elucidation, is, nevertheless, one substantially existing. All submission is not right and proper, neither is all resistance. Occasions arise in the history of all civil governments, when resistance to civil authority is obedience to God, and the reason why it arises is, because it is the legitimate tendency of power to pass from the hands of the many into those of the few.*

All governments are instituted primarily to enforce by human authority the observance of those rules of social life to which its relations are subjected by the Creator.

Hence, civil government is based on mere necessity. The necessity grows out of the disposition of man.

Men, as a general rule, are unwilling to obey the principles of moral government that form the rights of man in the social relations of life. Were they willing to yield submission to human rights, or right principles of social living, their ignorance of them would then be the only obstacle in the way of social harmony, and then this necessity would demand civil instruction and civil teachers, and not civil government with its pains and penalties.

But since they are unwilling to be restrained by the true science of social living—which is the divine government—the divine regulation of the relations of social life, then that specific necessity lays the foundation for *human* interference, in order, by practical or temporal pains and penalties, to *force or coerce men* to regard the right.

This force and this coercion, this application of temporal punishment, is the distinguishing feature, showing the distinction between the right and the proper regulation of the social state, and that to which mere human law-givers have, of necessity, to resort. This necessity justifies it, and nothing else.

* Paley has a remark on this subject that we have always thought of great weight, viz: "That the established government is to be obeyed so long as it cannot be resisted or changed without public inconvenience, and no longer." And to the question who shall judge on this subject, he says the proper answer is, "each man for himself."

Resistance to government should be, not for the sake of resistance itself, but for change; so that revolutions, looking to a change of rule, may truly be the embodiment of the love of it—the representation of a true conservatism. Hence, it is possible for a man to be the friend to liberty, and yet call for no community of good, and a lover of order and a revolutionist. As to when resistance should occur, we can be in no doubt, since it is merely a choice of two unavoidable evils. The question always is, which is the less evil: to submit to a government repugnant to your judgment or to resist in order to change? This question each man must decide for himself; and he acts patriotically, let him decide as he may, provided he decides from considerations of pure patriotism and not from selfish views. Hence, a man is not necessarily a tyrant because he sustains an oppressive government, nor necessarily a patriot because he opposes it. Honest men may differ, and may be on both sides of every civil revolution; and so of dishonest men. God reigns and rules, let the earth rejoice. Hence, order arises from disorder, and the most precious rights of man spring from the blood of patriots.

Why has it been so exceedingly difficult to give a proper definition of civil liberty? It never has been done and never will be.

The reason is, because government and liberty are incompatible.

Government means control. And what does control mean? It means the contrary of liberty. Mr. Christian, in his commentaries on Blackstone, unequivocally admits this.

What portion of civil government is of the most practical benefit to society? It is its restraining statutes. What portion of civil rule has the most lasting influence on members of society? Its punishment—its pains and penalties.

Take away the restraining statutes, and the pains and penalties of a temporal character that sanction and enforce them, that appertain to any existing civil government, and what remains would be utterly valueless as rules for social government and its temporal security.

We should never value government for the liberty which it accords, but for the wisdom and justice of the restraining statutes which it enforces; and we should accord praise to any government just precisely in proportion as its restraining statutes are in harmony with these restraining principles of moral government, to which the God of creation has subjected the relations of social life—principles that constitute the sum and substance of the rights of man.

All that any man wants from government is, effectually to prevent ill-disposed men from violating the right—from infringing the proper rules of social life. And it is just in proportion as it succeeds in this, that individual liberty and security are maintained. If this be so, do not individual liberty and security result—not as any gift or endowment of the government, but as the consequence or the effect of *restraining ill-disposed members of the body politic*.

Well-disposed men are not the proper objects of civil government. Ill-disposed men are. Let government succeed in controlling bad men, by coercing a practical observance of proper rules of social life, and then well-disposed men not only wish to have as little to do with human or civil rule as possible, but are fully prepared to attribute the happiness and concord of their social existence to the beneficence of an overruling Providence, and to those principles of social happiness to which he has subjected the several relations of the social state.

Civil government, we are well assured, grows out of its necessity, and reposes on the consent of the governed, and on nothing else. It has no foundation on the divine law, except what is incidentally given.

How absurd, therefore, the old idea of a social contract.

There is a very wide distinction between the consent of the governed, their continuing willingness, and a supposed contract between the rulers and the ruled.

Paley demolished this idea when he declared that it was never a fact—that contracts of government were in fact never made. They never were—never will be. No set of men will ever be silly enough to bind themselves by contract to obey rulers, except on the conditions that the government shall promote, and continue to promote, the public good—that is to say, to promote the contentment and satisfaction of the governed: and that is, to be governed according to their consent. The majority-rule here carries it, as the safest practical rule, to ascertain the contentment of the governed—a rule not invariably right, but the best in ordinary circumstances—best as a general rule.

Whenever a government ceases to be in harmony with the public judgment and public will, it at once *pro tanto* loses its warrant for its continued existence.

It is by this accommodation of governments to the public judgment in such matters that governments progress—move from despotic to liberal. Hence, they should not advance faster than the people improve, nor lag behind human civilization.

What is human civilization? It is merely human apprehension of, and obedience to, the principles of moral science prevailing in the social relations of life. That man is, therefore, civilized, who knows the right in social life and voluntarily obeys it. In proportion as he recedes from this knowledge and this voluntary obedience, does he approximate the savage state. Hence, nothing distinguishes the savage from the civilized state but the knowledge of, and the voluntary submission to, those permanent regulations of social life—regulations originating in the divine wisdom—regulations to which the entire fabric of social life is subjected. Hence, men may go back to the state of nature, or recede from it, and their governments will be, and should be, fair indices of their relative social condition, morally and intellectually. Hence, it would be just as foolish to bestow a liberal government on a savage race as a despotic one on a civilized people. If governments refuse, on the consent of the governed, that consent will be either wise or foolish, either for liberal or despotic rule, just precisely in proportion as the people yielding the consent are enlightened or otherwise. Hence, for one people, a despotism is the part of wisdom, and for another, a more liberal government.

What is a liberal government? It is one wherein there is but little governmental ruling. A despotic government is one wherein there is large power in the hands of the rulers, and much ruling. Hence, governments rule much or rule little, in the relations of social life, in proportion as the people know and voluntarily discharge those duties that tend to promote the public peace and prosperity. Hence, a people universally so disposed, would have need of no human rule at all. The science of social life, fully understood and fully obeyed, would answer all the ends sought to be effected by civil authority.

From this train of reasoning we arrive at the conclusion that civil government reposes on its necessity, and this necessity grows out of the evil dispositions of wicked and abandoned men and women.

Ignorance and vice are the father and mother of civil authority.

To say, therefore, that civil authority reposes for its foundation on the law of God, is a simple absurdity. Its true basis is the consent of the governed, and we are required by the divine law to submit to it, because it is necessary—because it is the less choice of two unavoidable evils—and not because of any conformity to the laws of God.

If the law of God, and not the consent of the governed, were the true foundation of civil rule, then no honest or conscientious man could obey a rule that, in his judgment, infringed the law of God. To adopt such an understanding as this would exalt private judgment to an authority in the state greater than that of the state itself. And this would be to abrogate and destroy all civil security and authority. Hence, no matter what may be the divine law, and what may be our conscientious convictions of it, our path of duty is plain, pending the existence of a conflict in our judgment between a divine rule and a rule established by the legitimate existing authority. We must submit to the latter for conscience sake.

Still, as moral government is ever harmonious, and human rule ever changing, by the exercise of the Christian duties, we may come in time to be relieved of the unhappy alternative. All good men bide their time in patience and brotherly kindness—in toleration and Christian affection.

ART. X.—ABOLITIONISM A CURSE TO THE NORTH AND A BLESSING TO THE SOUTH.

A kind Providence has overruled the evil designs of the Yankees, and has converted abolitionism into a blessing to the South and a curse to the North.

In Mr. Calhoun's celebrated letter to Mr. King, the foundation of abolitionism is traced with a master-hand to that British policy, which is looking to a monopoly of the rich products of tropical agriculture. Mr. Calhoun perceived that the abolition of associated labor in the Southern states, called negro slavery, was greatly desired by the British government; not from any motives of humanity, as alleged, but as a means of monopolizing the rich products of tropical industry—it being well known to that government that free negroes will not engage in field labor, and that the abolition of our Southern

system of labor would leave that colossal power without a competitor in tropical agriculture. The antislavery sentiment in England was very clearly demonstrated by Mr. Calhoun to be rooted in interest, and not in philanthropy or in religion.

Sugar, the sweet tooth in the head, not philanthropy or love for the negro, caused the abolition of negro slavery in the British West India islands. The whole population of those islands scarcely exceeded a single million. The libraries of the commercial and manufacturing cities of Great Britain abound with books, tracts and pamphlets (which have never had any circulation in foreign countries), written with the express view of demonstrating to the British public that the interests of all classes of society would be greatly promoted by paying the West India planters for their slaves and setting them free, as such a measure would place the one hundred and fifty millions of free laborers of the East Indies on an equal footing, in the production of sugar, with the one million in the West Indies. It was argued, that the slave laborers of the West Indies prevented the one hundred and fifty millions of free laborers in the East Indies from engaging in the sugar-making business, precisely as the slave laborers of Hayti prevented the free laborers of Bengal from engaging in the cultivation of the indigo plant until negro slavery in Hayti was overthrown; when the so-called free laborers of India immediately set about and produced three-fourths of all the indigo of the world; whereas, prior to the overthrow of negro slavery in Hayti, three-fourths of all the indigo in the markets of the world was produced in that island, and little or none in India. So, also, the downfall of slave labor in Jamaica, in the cultivation of the sugar-cane, has already been followed by a very extensive cultivation of that plant by cooly labor in Mauritius, and the British possessions in India, and other tropical colonies. Indeed, at the present day, England would monopolize the sugar market, if it were not for the slave-labor sugar of Cuba and Louisiana. The antislavery sentiment of the British public is radicated, as Mr. Calhoun perceived, not in philanthropy, religion, or any love for the African race, but in those great industrial interests from which British power and wealth draw their nutriment. Hence, that sentiment is universal throughout the British empire. Many of the sugar planters, who were ruined by the West India emancipation Act, are rapidly recovering their fortunes by sugar planting in India.

The parent antislavery societies of London, particularly that of Exeter Hall, were not instituted to influence the industrial, the manufacturing, the commercial, or the governing classes of Great Britain by motives of religion and philanthropy; because none of these classes have ever been influenced by such motives to act in opposition to their wordly interest, but they were instituted to mislead foreign governments, particularly the

puritanical, self-righteous portion of the American people, who, in religion and morals, generally make the bigoted Puritans they left behind in England their standard. The privileged clergy of Great Britain are as much a part of the government as the army or navy. They preached sentimental abolitionism to promote British policy. The bigots and Puritans among the dissenters, not wishing to be behind the privileged clergy in anything partaking of the character of philanthropy, Christianity, and the rights of man, preached sentimental abolitionism more earnestly and vociferously than the lord bishops, with salaries of from twenty to fifty thousand dollars per annum. The working clergy, hired by the privileged clergy to do their work, at salaries barely sufficient to purchase bread and clothing, also joined in thundering from the pulpit, that "*negro slavery is sin against God and the sum of all villainies.*" They had to do it or lose their places, called livings. It was this sentimental abolitionism that was exported and planted in Massachusetts and other Northern states. The exotic was of slow growth, though fed and watered by numerous local anti-slavery societies and foreign emissaries in sheep's clothing, until the dishonest, ignorant, selfish, political demagogues of the Northern states laid hold of it, and tied it as a broad phylactery on their foreheads to climb into power and place over the ruins of the Federal constitution. Churches were first split by it, then political parties, then open violations of the constitution, and, finally, the Southern states were compelled to seek protection against the intolerable despotism of fanatics, blind bigots and unprincipled demagogues, in secession. The total, complete and eternal separation from the Northern states, was effected by the establishment of a new government, and the creation of an independent power among the nations of the earth, under the title of the Confederate States of America. Thus was abolitionism converted into a blessing to the South.

When slavery was abolished in the West Indies under the pretence that enlarged notions of human liberty, progress in morals and Christianity (so far in advance of the age of Moses, the prophets and apostles, as to enable the present generation to see what they did not, that slavery is sin against God), had moved the Imperial Parliament to set the West India negroes free, it was generally supposed that the model republic would follow the example and liberate the slaves of the Southern states. Agents were immediately dispatched to India with American cotton seed, gins, and implements of husbandry, to introduce the culture of cotton on an extensive scale, by free labor in the East, to supply the deficiency which the abolition of slavery in our Southern states might occasion, or even to supersede America entirely in the culture of that king staple of tropical agriculture.

After a most protracted and violent agitation, slavery was

not abolished; nor did the experiments, made under the most favorable circumstances, for twenty years in succession, in every nook and corner of India, and the British possessions in Asia, Africa and Australia, give any grounds of reasonable hope that the empire of King Cotton could ever be transferred from the Southern states of America to any other country or region of the earth. The experiments to transfer the monopoly of the tobacco culture from Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri to other lands, have also failed. British abolitionism has filled its mission. It has not done all it was intended to do or was expected from it, but it has done wonders for the agricultural, commercial, industrial, manufacturing and governing classes of Great Britain, whose interests it was seeking. It has completely succeeded in transferring the valuable indigo culture from Hayti to British India; it has left Great Britain with no competitors in the sugar market but Louisiana and Cuba. Abolitionism has cursed the Yankees, by depriving them of their fishing bounties and their monopoly of the coasting trade, and has struck a death-blow at Yankee supremacy and rivalry on the ocean. Happily for Great Britain, it has forever crushed the dreaded competition of Yankee traders and manufacturers. But, great as has been the benefits it has conferred on all classes in Great Britain, they are exceeded by the benefits it has conferred on all classes in the Confederate States of America. It has built a permanent wall between the fanatics, knaves, poltroons, selfish, dishonest demagogues of the Northern states and the people of the Southern Confederacy. Nothing but abolitionism could ever have effected the commercial enfranchisement of the Southern states, or prevented them from continuing under the horrid despotism of the Northern majority, bent on plundering them by the devices of tariffs, monopolies, banks, bounties, and systems of internal improvements, looking to the aggrandizement of the North at the expense of the South.

Fortunately, however, for the independence of the Southern states, agents were sent over by Exeter Hall and the antislavery societies of London to propagate abolitionism in America. In the South they were simply regarded as deluded fanatics, unworthy of notice, or as enemies deprived of the power of doing much mischief from the unpopularity of the fundamental doctrine they preached—political, civil and social equality with negroes. Hence, very little was done by the Southern people or the Southern press to counteract such a doctrine as that, so abhorrent to the instincts of the white race, who were living in juxtaposition with the black. The instincts and every-day experience of all classes in Southern society were sufficient guaranties that the doctrine of negro equality could never take root in the South, no matter how industriously propagated; and that there was no absolute necessity for a word to be spoken or

written against it. So universal was this feeling, that it was even thought not worth while to require abolitionism to be expunged from the school books and newspapers, pamphlets, magazines and works of literature, to insure Southern patronage. This, however, proved to be an error in such districts as Western Virginia, East Tennessee and other localities, where the black population are so few in numbers that the whites have not an opportunity of learning, by daily experience, the fallacy of the antislavery dogmas. While the South treated such dogmas with contempt, societies were formed in the puritanical North to propagate them by antislavery presses and antislavery pulpits, and in every manner of way. Yet, for more than a quarter of a century, the Union sentiment in the South was too strong for the Northern invectives, daily hurled at her institutions, or to see how the South was cheated by its misalliance with the North. Even after the Southern churches split from the Northern, refusing to have an antislavery God and an antislavery Bible forced upon them, the Southern political parties continued to work harmoniously with the Northern, until the Northern demagogues seized upon the antislavery sentiment to elect an antislavery president by a numerical Northern majority—not for the sake of the negro or for the sake of the Exeter Hall dogmas, but to enable them, through a numerical Northern majority, to subjugate and plunder the South more effectually than they had heretofore done. It was not until abolitionism had driven that president to call for an army of seventy-five thousand men that the whole South became united, and with great unanimity determined forever to withdraw from the misalliance with the North. The people of the Southern states had no alternative but to give up their individual rights and submit to a sword government, or to look to a Southern confederacy and a new government to preserve their republican institutions and their individual rights. They have much cause to be thankful to Exeter Hall for the seed of abolitionism it sowed in the North. It was the ripening of those seed into *wide awakeism* which has severed the misalliance with the North and effected the political and commercial enfranchisement of the South.

It was the light emitted by the torches of the triumphant army of wide awakes which enabled all parties in the South to see clearly that their only hope of salvation was the rock of independence, on which their forefathers stood nearly a century ago in the contest with great Britain. To that rock they hastened. The movement was called *secession*. The Northern democracy, instead of permitting the Southern states to exercise their sovereign right of secession and to depart in peace, as democratic principles and the doctrine of state rights required them to do, turned traitors to their own principles, and joined the bigots and fanatics in a fierce aggressive war against the

states of the South for exercising the highest and the most essential right of sovereignty. They joined the larger army of the wide awakes, with a full knowledge that the demagogues in command of it were seeking the subjugation of the whites of the South, and the extermination of the blacks, at the very time they were hypocritically crying louder than the radical abolitionists themselves for the largest liberty to both races. Their new allies, by their aid, have not succeeded in wiping out negro slavery from the South, but have by their own help pretty well succeeded in wiping out political liberty and free government from the North. Having dug their own graves, now, while they are being covered with the ruins of their own political liberty, their manufacturing and commercial interests, if there be any people in the world who have cause to curse abolitionism and to despise Exeter Hall and British manufacturers for sending it among them, it is the Yankees.

The South has, or ought to have, no quarrel with British abolitionism. She owes her independence to it. It was the moving spring of the present war. But the war will be worth to the South ten times its cost, as it will demonstrate the strength, stability and permanency of a government founded on natural instead of artificial distinctions in society. What government in Europe could be less hurt than ours has been by an army of six hundred thousand men? Southern property will rise after the war is over to more than double what it was before the war began. Southern property was estimated at not more than half the value of Northern, owing to the supposed insecurity of our institutions in the South. If the present war cost the Confederate States five thousand millions, it would be more than ten times repaid in the enhanced value of Confederate States property. Great as its pecuniary benefits may be, its moral, intellectual and political will be greater. It will, moreover, set the minds of the many millions in Europe, engaged in the manufacture of Confederate States products, at rest in regard to the Southern supplies of the raw materials, as it will demonstrate that there is no danger of these supplies failing them.

Although it is very natural that England and France should desire to make their tropical possessions more valuable, by encouraging the cultivation of tropical products, yet the principal motive which has led the manufacturing and industrial classes into abolitionism, is the erroneous belief in the insecurity of the tenure of African slave labor in the Southern states of America. They feared that at any moment a stray spark of thought, hope or liberty, falling among a comparatively few negro slaves in America, would throw many millions of Europeans out of employment, break up the manufactories of cotton goods, and bring ruin, distress and disorder upon society, from the supply being cut off. Hence, they have co-operated most strenuously with their governments in stimulat-

ing and encouraging in their colonies the cultivation of tropical products, particularly cotton and tobacco, and also sugar, rice and indigo, by what is called cooly or free labor. We of the South have done little or nothing to make known to the world the great truth, that the tenure of African slave labor is as permanent and as durable as the everlasting hills. This war will demonstrate that truth to Europe, and cut up the cause of European abolitionism by the roots. In Great Britain and France, abolitionism is founded on certain real or supposed interests of the people advocating it. In the New England states, abolitionism is not founded on any real or supposed interest of the people advocating it, but on the fanaticism of the most intensely fanatical, self-conceited, self-righteous race of mankind—the Yankees. So self-righteous, vain and self-conceited as to be beguiled by the politicians of Exeter Hall (aiming to destroy their manufactures) into the fanatical idea that Moses and the prophets, the blessed Saviour and the apostles, were far behind the progressive, puritanical Yankees, in their perceptions of moral right and duty, as not to have seen and condemned a certain form of government, called slavery in English and Yankee dictionaries, as sin against God, and the sum of all villainies. So fanatical were they, that they did not even stop to inquire whether the government the negroes were under in the Southern states was the kind of government defined in the dictionaries as slavery—a government of force, or, an entirely different thing, a government of love, such as women and children are under everywhere. It was enough for the puritanical fanatics that it was called slavery. It was enough for the dishonest politicians and selfish demagogues (not only in New England, but in all the Northern states) to find slavery a capital hobby-horse, bridled and saddled at their doors, for them to ride into political power and place.

It was in vain to argue against either form of Northern abolitionism—the fanatical or the political. Consequently, the Southern people scarcely thought it worth while to persuade selfish demagogues to dismount from the hobby-horse, which gave them popularity and power, or to attempt to persuade the self-righteous fanatics that they were not more advanced in justice and righteousness than Christ and the apostles. But abolitionism stands on an entirely different foundation in Europe from what it does in New England and the Northern states. There it can be reached by reason. The manufacturers and dealers in our Southern products are not bigots and fanatics, or selfish demagogues climbing to political power. It is no romantic or sentimental love for negroes that actuates them, but love for themselves and the means by which they make their daily bread. They oppose negro slavery, not on account of any supposed sufferings and hardships of the negro laborers, over and above the sufferings and hardships of European labor-

ers. The most of them are sensible men, and look at facts. Facts declare that the black laborers in the Southern states, though called slave laborers, are happier and better provided with the essential comforts of life than the larger portion of free white laborers in Europe. They do not oppose the institution of negro slavery in America on abstract political or religious grounds (or at least the intelligent portion of them do not), because they are apprised of the fact, that the four millions of the so-called slaves in the Southern states, are further advanced in civilization and Christianity than any four millions of the African race that ever inhabited any other portion of the earth. But, they simply oppose it because of its supposed insecurity, and their fears that their supplies of cotton, and other products of negro slave labor may, at any moment, fail them, if they depend on so insecure a source of supply—hence their anxiety to become independent of slave labor products. But, as slave labor competition, in the article of cotton, tobacco, sugar and rice, is supposed to stand in the way of the cultivation of these articles by cooly and white labor, on a scale sufficiently extensive to supply the markets of the world, they imagine that their interests require its abolition. If once convinced, however, of the security and permanency of the institutions of the Confederate States (and this war will convince them of that fact), they will drop their idle fears of a deficiency in the supply of cotton and tobacco, at least, ever failing them. When convinced of that truth, there will scarcely be an abolitionist among them. No manufacturer, operative, or dealer in cotton goods, would be so inhumane as to entice white men, and drive coolies to face disease, and almost certain destruction, in the cultivation of cotton, which is a healthful and agreeable exercise to negro laborers, if convinced that there was no necessity for such inhumanity. No manufacturer, if sure of always having an abundant supply of superior American cotton, at a fair price, would be willing to put himself to inconvenience, and to diminish his profits by working short time, and submitting to the present blockade, to encourage the culture of an inferior article in India and elsewhere by free labor, which cannot afford to make it as cheap as the superior article is made in the Confederate States by negro labor.

In the Confederate States, ten cents per pound for a good article of cotton is a remunerative price: the cost of production being about half that sum. In India and elsewhere, nothing can be made by the culture; while the American article can be purchased at a price not much exceeding ten cents. It is only when some temporary or artificial cause has run up the price to some twenty or thirty cents, that any profit can be derived from its culture by white or cooly labor.

The present blockade, by preventing the American crops from reaching the market, has enhanced the price much beyond its

intrinsic value. The high price tends greatly to encourage the culture in India and other countries much less congenial to the cotton plant than the Confederate States, and by laborers who perish, instead of thrive as the Southern negroes do, in the chilling dews and the suffocating heat of the cotton fields. Our Northern enemies are seriously proposing to grow cotton in southern Illinois and Indiana to supply the yankee looms. It is not improbable that the article there grown, would be inferior to that of British India. But it is manifest that the culture would be unprofitable, unless the present high prices can be sustained. The blockade has given an artificial value to the article beyond the limits of the Confederate States. It will come down to its true value and prove unprofitable to all those engaged in its culture elsewhere, as soon as the blockade is raised, unless we work against ourselves and sustain the foreign cultivators of our great staple by planting less or only half crops. What the manufacturers mostly want is a sufficient supply of good cotton at a fair price. While we make enough to supply the market of the world, the Empire of King Cotton never can be removed from the Confederate States. We can regulate the culture, so as to make it sufficiently remunerative, by avoiding an excess beyond the demands of the market on the one hand, or a deficiency on the other so great as to render its cultivation profitable in other countries. Our interests rightly understood and the interests of the foreign manufacturers are identical. They want a sufficient supply of good cotton at a fair price, to feed their looms. We can give it to them. The Confederate States is the only country in the world that can do it. We could not make cotton at any price, if our present system of negro labor was abolished. So far, therefore, from the manufacturers having any interest in the abolition of negro slavery in the Confederate States, they have a direct interest in maintaining it. Foreigners do not understand our system of labor, from not understanding the ethnology of the negro. They think, if it be true that the negro is inferior to the white man, and incapable of being elevated to a level with the European, that the European had better supply his place, and let him disappear as the Indian has. Whereas, the truth is, that in the cotton field the negro laborer is as much superior to the white man as the white man is superior to the negro in the cabinet.

It is the interest of the manufacturers to keep these superior negro slave laborers in the cotton field. If set free, exterminated, or driven back to their native Africa, or the cotton region Africanized, the inhabitants of the civilized world would lose the cheap material wherewith they are clothed. All nations are interested in retaining the sable sons of Africa in a position where they are the undoubted superiors of any other race of mankind—where their labor produces rich fruits, that all partake of, and while, at the same time, the laborers them-

selves, though called slaves, labor with the same apparent diligence, good will and cheerfulness as the slave laborers, called neuters, that nature has supplied the bee-hive with. The former seem to be as happy in the tedious labor of gathering the down of the expanded pods of the cotton plant, as the latter in gathering honey from the opening flowers. We know not the reason why, in the economy of nature, the labor of making honey is imposed on one kind of bees, to all appearances the slaves of the rest, yet we admit the facts and act in conformity thereto. Facts speak no less plainly that the labor of making cotton, sugar, rice and tobacco has been imposed on a particular kind of the human family, apparently slaves of the rest; but not slaves, in the proper sense of the term, any more than the bees are, because nature has adapted them to find pleasure in the particular species of labor she has imposed upon them, which is most irksome to those she has not qualified to perform it. The very kind of labor that negroes most delight in and is the most healthful to them, as that of making cotton, sugar, rice and tobacco, is most irksome and unhealthful to all other races of men. We fight against nature's laws in seeking to impose tropical field labor on the white and olive races, and to release the black race from it, and we, moreover, violate true liberty in so doing. The spirit of liberty demands a place for every thing and every thing in its place, and that the various individuals composing society should contribute to its welfare in a manner most suitable and congenial to their natures. Commercial enfranchisement is based on the same principle of letting nature, instead of art, dictate the laws of trade between friendly nations.

ART. XI.—COMMERCIAL ENFRANCHISEMENT OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES.

A powerful article under the above caption, understood to have been written by that accurate statistician and successful merchant, J. S. Loudon, Esq., of Richmond, appeared in the October and November number of De Bow's Review. It had been previously submitted to the Commercial Convention of Macon, last autumn, as a memorial from a citizen of Virginia, and, by a resolution of that body, was recommended to the attention of the several states and important cities of the Confederacy. It was printed with the proceedings of the Convention. Its suggestions of the expediency of adopting a modification of the French system of weights and measures; the establishment of an exchequer; the adjustment of corporation taxes, so as to release trades and professions of burdensome

restrictions; and especially the imposition upon all vessels from Abolitiondom of a rigid and expensive police corps, from their entrances to their departure from Southern waters, seem to be eminently worthy of adoption as soon as the present war terminates. If, in addition to the police corps on board of vessels, Jersey wagons and land carriages and pack-horses were included, a wall of adamant would not be more effectual in bringing about that desirable result—the putting a final stop to commercial relations between the North and the South. The establishment of a new and more perfect and convenient system of weights and measures, though attended with some inconveniences at first, is of more importance to our commercial independence than the most of persons, who have not considered the subject, might suppose. But the recommendation of withholding the cotton and tobacco of the Confederate States from the European market, during the continuance of the war with the Yankees, is thought to be impolitic; as, also, the recommendations made in other quarters, and by various writers and politicians, of planting only half crops or no crops at all, of these valuable Southern staples. Many able politicians, besides the able author of the article in *De Bow's Review*, firmly believe with him that “such a measure,” the nonexportation of cotton and tobacco from the Confederate States, “persevered in for a short time, would carry famine and want to the homes and firesides of millions of human beings in all the manufacturing and commercial nations of the world—and would beget for us friends where they are the most needed, viz., among the commercial and manufacturing nations of Europe, who would be compelled to open our ports for us, and to diminish the existing duties on tobacco.” Perhaps they would, if Dixie embraced within her limits all the soil on which cotton and tobacco will grow. But in proof that cotton and tobacco will grow elsewhere, it is only necessary to call to mind the fact, that from a third to a fourth of these articles consumed by Great Britain are grown in her own tropical possessions.

ART. XII.—THE RIGHT OF SECESSION AND COERCION.

The right of withdrawing from an existing government and setting up a separate one, when any large portion of its people may think that it is exercised to their injury and oppression, at first view must seem too revolutionary in itself, and calculated to too much weaken any government to be tolerated. Let this be admitted to be true as a general proposition. On the other hand, it is equally true that governments, like individuals, may

make laws for themselves, and may prescribe the terms on which they will consent to be united; and this law will be their guide, and the substantial infraction of it will justify either for withdrawing, or they may make their continuance together dependent on their will. There is a marked difference always to be kept in view between the American government and all others. All other governments, whether separated by shires, counties, or districts, never as such having any separate rights of government, are only parts of one whole, and are bound together by their majorities to the government so constituted, and resistance to it must be regarded as revolutionary. The American government is not composed of shires or counties, but of independent sovereignties, possessing all the rights of self-government, and the authority to enter into any compacts, treaties, leagues, or covenants, and to prescribe the terms on which they do so. They have all the privileges incident to sovereignty, of either England, France, or any other government, and may limit the continuance of their remaining united either to a specified time, or make it dependent on their will. They have done this latter, and the terms have been accepted, and on such compact the present agreement is based. It is their law, and must be their guide, however unwise it may be regarded as applicable to the condition of other nations.

The possible abuse of this great privilege being left with the states, was foreseen by the wise framers of the Federal constitution; and various and persevering efforts were made to avoid it, by giving to the congress the control over the decisions of the states, and all refused. Four different clauses were proposed having this object, and all refused: the states were so jealous of their sovereignty. They intended to give nothing that was not so clearly expressed; and nowhere in the constitution is authority to decide to be found, where any state in its sovereignty shall decide one way and congress another. No umpire to decide was given, and if it had been insisted on, there would have been no Union, and the states would have remained separate sovereignties. There is yet stronger authority for the right of secession being dependent on the will of the states. The formation of the constitution was dependent on the adoption of the states, and they, of course, had the right to annex such qualifications or conditions on doing so as thought proper, and if accepted, was binding on the Union. Several states accepted without, but some did annex conditions, and Virginia did that of the privilege of resuming when the powers granted to the Union should be perverted to her *injury* or *oppression*, and that every power not granted remains with her to be exercised at her *will*. The terms of acceptance in her ratification act are as follow :

"We, the delegates of the people of Virginia, duly elected, in pursuance of a recommendation from the general assembly, and now met in conven-

tion, and having fully and freely investigated and discussed the proceedings of the Federal convention, and being prepared as well as the most mature deliberation hath enabled us to decide thereon. *do*, in the name and on behalf of the people of Virginia, declare and make known that the powers granted under the constitution being derived from the people of the United States, may be resumed by them whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury and oppression, and that every power not granted thereby, remains with them and at their *will*."

At whose will does the privilege of judging when their rights are perverted and resuming depend? Surely, not on that of the congress of the United States, seeing that the clause was inserted as a guard against their assumption of power. It can only mean the will of the state. From the authorities above referred to—from the reason and necessity of the case, and the known views of the great states' right party of that day—there is but one correct conclusion to be come to, and that is, that the states have the right, acting in their sovereign capacity, to withdraw from the Union, and create a new government they may think more suitable to their interests. They have, in their sovereign capacity, through conventions, formed a new government, and sent commissioners to say that they had done so, and were willing to pay for any property they had taken, and to arrange all matters between the two governments in such manner as was equitable, just, and proper. These commissioners have not been recognized, but have been contemptuously refused an audience. They deny the right of secession, and claim the right of coercing ten millions of people, and without authority, and are levying war for its enforcement. The constitutions of the states are the limitations of power which the people of each state, in their sovereign capacity, have prescribed as barriers to legislation. The constitution of the Federal government is a grant of power, and the authority for its exercise; and if not to be found in it it does not exist, and the right of coercion is not there.

ART, XIII.—CAUSE AND CONTRAST—THE AMERICAN CRISIS.

[We are permitted to extract a chapter from the volume which Messrs. West & Johnston have recently issued from the press with the above title. It is from the sprightly and vigorous pen of T. W. McMahon, of Richmond, Va., who has shown himself profoundly versed in all the relations of the great controversy of arms now raging between the United and Confederate States. The volume should be in the hands of every good citizen among us, as furnishing a reason for his faith and an incentive to the most heroic efforts in behalf of the great cause which involves everything that is dear to the hearts of freemen.]

A government which does not rest upon the consent of the governed, is necessarily an odious and bad government—bad,

because even the benefits it may confer are the fruits of usurpation. If the axiom be true, that the power of governing is but the commission of God to the ruler, the trust is sufficiently onerous and responsible, even when willingly acquiesced in by the governed. But for him that usurps power to rule over a people who despise him, there can be no other name than TYRANT. To govern a people against their will is a crime against humanity, an insult to reason, and an outrage upon liberty. Such a ruler must, of necessity, be a conqueror. His jurisdiction is maintained by the remorseless ravage of states—by covering his path with death, terror and desolation—by rendering himself hateful to the virtuous, sacrificing the heroic, and enslaving the free. The bravest of his friends and foes fall together, the victims of his pride, tyranny and usurpation. Having become himself the first violator of public law, his followers will emulate his evil example, until general crime takes the place of regular order, and the fiercer passions of hatred and revenge substitute humanity and sociology. By his influence, commerce and agriculture are ruined—the plastic and mechanic arts sink into decrepitude—science, literature and religion are neglected or forgotten—demoralization becomes contagious—good men are forced, or deluded, into a copartnership of action with the despicable—villainy and profligacy are licensed to invade the sanctuaries of virtue and purity—and while innocence and industry are stripped of armor and shield, indecency and crime stalk abroad gigantic, unchecked and unpunished: for these are inevitable consequences of war.

And even when war is justly waged; when it is fortified by principles of humanity and right; when the patriot's sword is unsheathed to defend his country's liberties; its evils are only extenuated, but not obliterated. It brings jealousy and rivalry into the camp of friends; it covers the earth with carnage; it strips the parent of the child; it divorces the husband from his wife; it sets villages and cities in flames; it converts happy homes into temples of misery and mourning; it makes of smiling Ceres a woful suppliant; and the proudest victory is achieved upon the ruins of a flourishing glory. The martyr's crown, and the praise of history, may reward the patriot who falls in defence of his freedom; but when the sword is drawn to oppress, he who wields it is a murderer and a robber.

But since the world began—since war first cursed earth and degraded man—it would be difficult to discover, in the pages of universal history, the record of so unholy and iniquitous a civil strife as that into which Abraham Lincoln has plunged the American states. The war which he wages is a bastard begotten of power and arrogance. He, his advisers, and the section of the old republic to which he belongs, had, during the quarter of a century previous to his inauguration, heaped abuse, and outrage, and wrong, upon the people they are now endeavoring

to crush, subjugate and exterminate. They represented that the South hung, like a mill-stone, round the neck of the Union, retarding her progress and blighting her prosperity. They inculcated in all of their moral teachings and political proclamations—some directly and others indirectly—that she would be “let slide,” or that slavery should be abolished, ere the North could take her proper place among the nations. And, resolved at length to preserve her institutions, protect her property, and bear the responsibility of her own sins and disadvantages, the South separated herself from what seemed to be a dissatisfied partner; but implored a continuance of peace and friendship in parting. Here the North changed front. She declared that the South should not depart; that she should still remain in the Union, but as an inferior, without the protection guaranteed by the constitution, and stripped of her four thousand millions of dollars worth of slave property.

This is not the language of exaggeration; it is the doctrine promulgated by the Northern press, enunciated by Northern leaders, and practised and carried out by Northern generals, ever since the godless invasion of the Northern hordes begun Charles Sumner, in a speech recently delivered by him before the Republican convention of the State of Massachusetts, declared that slavery should be abolished, and the South conquered. Wendell Phillips, the Belial of this great infernal plot, whose

“——— tongue
Dropp’d manna, and could make the worse appear
The better reason,”

in language more classical and forcible than that of his rhetorical colleague in crime, maintained that such was the object of this relentless war. General Jim Lane said there would be an army of *one color* marching into slave states, and an army of *another color* marching out. Rev. Dr. Bellows, in consecrating the arms of Northern regiments, invoked God to speed the abolition cause. Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge declared that this rebellion shall be put down, it matters not at what expenditure of money, or what sacrifice of the blood of rebels, or their wives and children! The Rev. Dr. Hitchcock, the Rev. Mr. Goodell, John Jay, Oliver Johnson, and other shining lights of the North, lay and clerical, have gone still farther than Phillips or Sumner. At a public meeting held a few weeks since in the City of New York, convened for the purpose of devising a plan whereby the present fratricidal conflict should be made “short and decisive,” it was resolved that “the speedy and complete liberation of the slaves on the soil,” had become a necessity; that to effect this, “the free colored people of the United States should be encouraged to enlist in the great enterprise;” and that, as Leo X had said, not only the Christian religion, but nature, cried out against slavery. “The utmost good nature

pervaded the meeting, and the feeling in favor of the *immediate abolition of slavery*, as a necessity of the war power, was unanimous," according to the New York Times. This same journal afterward inculcated, that there could be no peace—no end of war—no compromise—while slavery existed. The Chicago Tribune—understood to be the leading organ of Mr. Lincoln in Illinois—re-echoed the language of the Times, branded the Southern institution as the sum of all villainies, and laid down the axiom, that "whenever a slave is claimed as the property of another, the claimant is a traitor and a rebel." "In the course of events," says the Boston Transcript, "the hour has arrived for settling the question, whether the inherent despotism of the slave power, or a republic true to freedom, shall rule from the lakes to the gulf, from ocean to ocean." "We hold that slavery is the cause of the war," responds the Delaware (N. Y.) Express, "and that it is the duty of those in whom lie the power, to rid the country of this cause." "The North is in arms against slavery," exclaims the Rockland (Me.) Gazette; "it is fighting against the slavery interest and nothing else." "There cannot and never will be peace again in what formed the United States, so long as slavery exists in the South," is an apothegm from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Telegraph. The New York World will accept from the South not even "abdication." "When there is danger," it adds, "that it shall come to that, let slaveholders beware. The day it is settled that either slavery or the government must perish, that day slavery will be doomed." And again: "If the North cannot conquer rebellion without emancipation, it will conquer it with emancipation." "Close the column, and let the battle rage with Napoleonic fury; while the earth shall open to receive, heaven will expand to accommodate the spirits of those that shall fall"—shouts the Cincinnati Times, borrowing its theology from Mohammed.

In harmony with this settled purpose—with such devilish and fanatical teachings—and with the long-nurtured resolution of their section, the Northern army and its officers, immediately upon their invasion of Southern soil, commenced a remorseless pillage of slave property. This policy was a part of the war strategy of General Rosencranz in Western Virginia—a policy whereby it was hoped to make wavering minds loyal to the "Union." It was practised by Gen. B. F. Butler, while he commanded at Fortress Monroe, upon a splendid scale; his hired myrmidons having robbed farmers, whose only crime was devotion to freedom, of over one thousand negroes—which the invaders naively denominated "contrabands." And this exploit of degraded rapine, on the part of an inglorious and pusillanimous commander, was sanctioned by President Lincoln's Secretary of War, Simon Cameron. But it was reserved for General Fremont to cross the Rubicon of barbarism—to endeavor to have re-enacted, in the South, that ineffably horrible

spectacle which desecrated the soil of Hayti. Appointed major-general to command the Federal army in, and subjugate the State of Missouri, one of his first official acts was to issue an edict of emancipation to the blacks! Regarding this step as politically imprudent and premature, until his heel could be more firmly planted upon the necks of Maryland and Kentucky, Mr. Lincoln requested his subordinate to "modify" the proclamation. But Fremont knew his master's heart. He disregarded the request, had a new supply printed after its receipt, and circulated his own decree broad-cast over Missouri.

There is an identity in the acts of tyrants, which cannot fail of making sad impressions upon the mind of a historian. Twice, within a period of less than a single century, have two different and implacable foes sought the bloody spoliation of the South, by means of servile insurrections. On the 7th day of November, 1775, Lord Dunmore issued, in Virginia, a proclamation similar in spirit and intent to that addressed by General Fremont, in 1861, to the people of Missouri. "You may observe," writes the former three days afterward to General Howe, "that I offer freedom to the blacks of all white rebels that join me, in consequence of which there are two or three hundred already come in, and those I form into corps as fast as they come in, giving them white officers and noncommissioned in proportion. And from this plan I make no doubt of getting men enough to *reduce this colony to a proper sense of their duty.*" A Virginia convention indignantly responded to the proclamation; but the final reply was given by George Washington, at the cannon's mouth, before Yorktown, to Lord Cornwallis, in 1781. And how well Missouri has emulated these noble examples, in answering the ordinance of Fremont, let the battles which she fought, and the victories which she won, at Springfield and Lexington, relate: for there is a coincidence of virtue in the deeds of patriots, as there is of baseness in the actions of tyrants.

But it is melancholy, because it is far from being hopeful to the cause of human freedom, to reflect that from the great experiment of American liberty could spring a government, characterized by a despotic frenzy which overshadows that of the administration of Lord North: and that, more than a century ago, the relations of master and servant should have been better understood by an Irishman than they are now by our adversaries. "The high aristocratic spirit of Virginia and the Southern colonies, it has been proposed, I know," said Edmund Burke, "to reduce, by declaring a general enfranchisement of their slaves. This project has had its advocates and panegyrists; yet I never could argue myself into any opinion of it. Slaves are often much attached to their masters. A general wild offer of liberty would not always be accepted. History furnishes few instances of it. It is sometimes as hard to per-

swade slaves to be free, as it is to compel freemen to be slaves. * * * But when we talk of enfranchisement, do we not perceive that the American master may enfranchise too, and arm servile hands in defence of freedom? * * * Slaves, as these black people are, and dull as all people are from slavery, must they not a little suspect the offer of freedom from *that very nation which has sold them to their present masters?*" But Burke, who looked over the heads of centuries, spoke truth in vain. George III and Lord North resolved upon the subjugation of the colonists. The colonists were British subjects—they were children of Great Britain—they owed allegiance to the English crown—they were "rebels"—the British constitution was founded upon justice and benignity, and its supremacy should be maintained: albeit Americans were deprived of a full participation in its benefits.

The fruit of this insolently wicked policy has passed into the the morals of history. And yet it is revived, copied, adopted, by the administration of Abraham Lincoln. They have both perverted and violated the constitution of their country. That grand instrument of human liberty, begotten of the wisdom of purest statesmanship, baptized in the blood of noblest patriots, and fostered through a long term of suffering and self-denial, has been by them corrupted and deflowered. According to its own preamble, it was framed to "establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, and promote the general welfare" of the several states embraced in the perfect Union. But, according to Mr. Lincoln and his cabinet, its purpose was to consummate a consolidated nationality, and overthrow the integrity of state sovereignty. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution"—reads the tenth article of the great charter—"are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." "The states have no power, other than that which they derive from the nation," replies the government at Washington.

But the states were separate, sovereign and independent, before the constitution had existence. They were sovereign, independent, and separate, when they rebelled against the despotic authority of the mother country. Governor Bernard, in his official dispatches, styled them "the American governments." And they remained, respectively, independent, separate and sovereign, *after* the constitution was ordained. Some of these governments refused, for a time, to adopt it as a league of alliance. Even when they acceded, they still retained their individual constitutions, legislatures, laws, distinctive usages, and every paraphernalia of freedom; and where usurpation (as in Maryland) has not prevailed, they do so now. The Federal constitution had to be ratified by the conventions of the respective states: by this mode only it could attain the virtue of becoming vital. Had it been rejected by a majority of the

states, it would have forever remained inanimate. But, having been adopted, did it necessarily follow that, in the case of its violation, it must be perpetual—that it was to remain binding forever upon the unborn generations of the incomprehensible future? If so, then it resembles wedlock, which none but God should put asunder. If so, it is an anomaly in legislation; or, all legislative acts are irrepealable and eternal. "But here is an extraordinary case—a case of public polity," objects the sophist. Aye, but it is, nevertheless, a mere matter of international contract; and Equity, the handmaiden of Justice, must rule states by the same standard which is prescribed to individuals. "A bargain broken on one side is broken on both," said Daniel Webster—in discussing a similar topic—than whom, whatever may have been his defects as a statesman, there was no greater expositor of the constitution and the laws.

But, in the expression of this opinion, he simply coincided with the well-known doctrines of the Revolutionary fathers. *They* never regarded the Union other than a confederacy of states, leagued together "for the common defence, and to promote the general welfare." And so the several governments viewed it; otherwise the Union never would have been formed. Mr. Madison maintained that a breach of the fundamental principles of Union compact, by any one part of the societies composing it, would fully absolve the other parts from their voluntary obligations to it; because that the Federal Union constituted a mere convention of individual states, governed by the law of nations, from which it resulted, that "a breach of any one article, by any one party, left all the other parties at liberty to consider the convention as dissolved." From the earliest *thought* of Union, until the illicit introduction of modern heresy, this was the political philosophy of American government. "Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States"—reads the second of the articles of the old confederation. "The said states," says the next article, "hereby severally enter into a firm *league of FRIENDSHIP* with each other, for their common defence, the securities of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to *assist each other*." Here is the testimony of the dead, vindicating the original and invariable attitude of the South, and illustrating the doctrines which created the old Union. And when these articles proved inadequate—when it became necessary that congress should have the power of raising a revenue to sustain government and pay off the revolutionary debt—and when, accordingly, the present Federal constitution was framed, the states, with singular caution and jealousy, watched and guarded the securities of their individual sovereignties. For commercial reasons, the State of Rhode Island refused to adopt the constitution, until

two years had transpired after its adoption by eleven of the other states. North Carolina remained, for other reasons, but similar in principle, one year out of the Union. And Maryland remained three years out of the old confederation, because the extent of Virginia's share of the territories was so great as to endanger the future equilibrium of state sovereignty. Virginia at length magnanimously removed this cause of difficulty, by ceding her western territorial empire to the convention of states; out of which gift have since been formed the great and antagonistic commonwealths of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan. So Achilles lent his arms to Patroclus, not indeed to be used against him or the Hellenic cause; but Hector, in the armor of Pelides, could not be deemed more unnatural by Hellas, than to the eye of reason appears the strange sight of these states, arming to subjugate their parental benefactress, and suffocate the principles which gave them liberty and life.

But in the face of this attempted matricidal crime—the sin of black ingratitude, and of a devastating invasion—in defiance of the fundamental tenets of the revolution, and of the time-hallowed doctrines of the fathers, those states are now in arms against nature, history, and reason. As early as 1798, the author of the Declaration of Independence, Mr. Jefferson, held “that the several states composing the United States of America, are not united on the principle of unlimited submission to their general government; but that * * * * *

* * as in all other cases of compact, having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress.” And this was the theory espoused by Patrick Henry, James Madison, Edmund Randolph, Mason and Nicholas. The idea of the general government's having any power other than that of mere agency, was regarded as un-American and iniquitous. “To coerce the states is one of the maddest projects that was ever devised,” said Alexander Hamilton. “This constitution,” asserted Mr. Ellsworth, “does not attempt to coerce sovereign bodies, states, in their political capacities. No coercion is applicable to such bodies.” And, during the seventy-two years of our past American self-government, the constitution was administered sixty of those years, in harmony with these Southern principles, and mainly by Southern statesmen. Washington's rule lasted eight years; Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, ruled twenty-four years; Jackson was President eight years; and the reins of government were wielded for sixteen years by Harrison, Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Fillmore and Pierce. Add to these the four years administration of President Buchanan, and we have sixty, out of the seventy-two years, of Southern policy in increasing the grandeur and perpetuating the liberty of America. But throughout this period it was never denied, to any consid-

erable or dangerous extent, that the people of one generation, and of any one political commonwealth, had the right to duly assemble in convention, and alter or modify their present institutions. The sovereignty of the states was conceded to be the sheet anchor of the republic—was regarded as sacred, inherent, inalienable and unrestricted. For instance (and merely as an illustration), in the year 1845, it was proposed to admit Texas as a state into the league of United States. On the 1st day of March, by joint resolution, congress consented “that the territory properly included and rightfully belonging to the *Republic of Texas* may be erected into a new state;” and that “the said Republic of Texas *shall retain* all the public funds, debts, taxes, and dues of every kind, which may belong to or be due and owing said republic,” etc., etc.; “*but in no event are said debts and liabilities to become a charge on the government of the United States.*” Here we witness the latter power in the character of an agent, but the former in the garments of a sovereign. On the 29th day of December following, it was declared by congress, “That the State of Texas shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original states.” That “footing” consisted of being secured in the guaranties of the Federal constitution, which stipulates upon its face to insure every state a republican form of government, and their people, to the latest posterity, the blessings of liberty.

Now, this was a contract, with well-marked and carefully defined limits, between the United States of America and the Republic of Texas, resembling, in a moral sense at least, every other honorable covenant made between men or nations; and the latter, finding the conditions of the league violated—finding usurpation instead of republicanism—tyranny in lieu of liberty—war in the place of blessings—injustice for equity—would she not, of natural right, be absolved from the partnership, and have “an equal right to judge for herself as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress?” He who would deny it, has studied neither Grotius nor Vattel—Blackstone nor Kent—he is ignorant of law.

This, however, is not fable; it is fact. The principles upon which rested the edifice of Union have been ruthlessly subverted. The sovereignty of the states has not only been invaded, but its existence pronounced a mere myth. State conventions have been dispersed; state legislatures banished or imprisoned; state laws set at open defiance; state elections tampered with and corrupted; and the United States gazetted to mankind as a CONSOLIDATED NATIONALITY. “The Union gave each of the states”—wrote Mr. Lincoln in his message to the Northern congress, July, 1861—“whatever independence and liberty it had. The Union is older than any of the states,

and in fact it created them as states.”* The brazen effrontery of these falsehoods, or the invincible ignorance of their author, might well excite either the pity or contempt of a philosopher, did not history teach that audacity and perfidy are characteristics of tyrants. The commonwealth of Virginia, whose sages were instrumental in forming the Union, and out of whose territories were made sovereign states, is told that she is younger than the Union; North Carolina, which hesitated for more than one year to ratify the constitution of the United States, is taught that by the Union she was first made a state; and the Republic of Texas is informed, that “whatever independence or liberty she had,” flowed from the same source! Surely, the North has a Daniel in her presidential chair.

“I do solemnly swear, that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the States, and will, to the best of my ability, *preserve*, protect, and defend the constitution of the United States”—was the inauguration oath of Abraham Lincoln. That constitution recognizes the sovereign independence of each and every state—guarantees to them separate and free forms of government—renders their laws and possessions exempt from all external influences—upholds them as equal partners of a general agency—gave to congress the power of *regulating* the territories for the mutual advantage of all—and clothed it with absolute and exclusive jurisdiction (except in adjusting what might promote the general welfare) only in a district of ten miles square; but Mr. Lincoln interpreted the constitution, and respected his oath, so as to render state governments mere nullities—political toys—nonentities. He created new offices, and swarmed upon independent states hiring myrmidons to devour their substance. He raised standing armies without law and without authority. He rendered the military power absolute over the civil. And he made the jurisdiction of the constitution the slave of his will. The right of the Federal authority to make war upon, or coerce a state into obedience, was, in the convention that framed it, indignantly denied to the constitution; but he has undertaken to subjugate and lay waste fourteen states, and to crush their peoples beneath the fiery heel of war. Congress alone had power to raise

* Such is his opinion. But in a speech delivered by him, in the United States House of Representatives, Jan. 12th, 1848, he said: “Any people, anywhere, being inclined, and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right—a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world. Nor is the right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government may choose to exercise it. Any portion of such people that *can*, may revolutionize, and make their own of so much of the territory as they inhabit. More than this, a majority of any portion of such people may revolutionize, putting down a minority intermingled with, or near about them, who may oppose their movements. Such minority was precisely the case of the tories of our own revolution. It is a quality of revolutions not to go by *old* *LINES*, or *old* *laws*; but to break up both and make *new* ones.”

and support armies; and to provide for organizing and disciplining the militia; but he usurped this power by issuing his proclamation calling seventy-five thousand men into the field. Congress alone had the right to declare war, to provide for and maintain a navy; but this power he assumed without authority. The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, says the constitution; but upon this privilege he has trampled in Maryland, Missouri and Kentucky. The right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition government for a redress of grievances was equally inalienable; yet this right was abolished in New York by police intervention. So, "no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause;" but Mr. Lincoln procured the arrest of inoffensive citizens without *either* warrant or cause.* The same constitution provides that in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall be informed of the nature and cause of accusation; *he* hurried hundreds to the dungeons of his prisons and denied to them the benefits of this provision. It guaranteed that no person should be held guilty of treason, unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court; but without evidence, authority of court, or form of trial, *he* has condemned and incarcerated men and women upon mere suspicion. It provided that in all criminal prosecutions, the accused should be entitled to the assistance of counsel for his defence; *he* has confined within the walls of a military fortress one of counsel for such prisoners (Algernon S. Sullivan); and, although entitled to "a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury," he was never confronted by an accuser. By virtue of the eighth amendment to the constitution, excessive bail should not be asked, excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted; yet

* As a single individual illustration of the Northern despotism, we will simply refer to the case of Mrs. Greenhow, the widow of the late Professor Greenhow, formerly principal translator in the United States Department of State. From a communication addressed by her to Secretary Seward, we make the following extract: "I most respectfully submit, that on Friday, August 23d, without warrant or other show of authority, I was arrested by the detective police, and my house taken in charge by them; that all my private letters and papers of a life-time, were read and examined by them; that every law of decency was violated in the search of my house and person, and by the surveillance over me. We read in history, that the poor Maria Antoinette had a paper torn from her bosom by lawless hands, and that even a change of linen had to be effected in sight of her brutal captors. It is my sad experience to record even more revolting outrages than that, for during the first days of my imprisonment, whatever necessity forced me to seek my chamber, a detective stood sentinel at the open door. And thus, for a period of seven days, I, with my little child, was placed absolutely at the mercy of men without character or responsibility; that during the first evening, a portion of these men became brutally drunk, and boasted in my hearing of the "nice times" they expected to have with the female prisoners; and that rude violence was used toward a colored servant girl during that evening, the extent of which I have not been able to learn. For any show of decorum afterwards practised towards me, I was indebted to the detective called Captain Dennis." Mrs. Greenhow adds, that in her own house, which has been converted into her prison, a public prostitute is lodged and supported by the Federal government.

Mr. Lincoln refuses to grant his victims trial—refuses to accept bail on their behalf—and has committed many of them to the cells invariably selected for murderers, notorious criminals, and incorrigible vagabonds. No person should be subject, for the same offence, to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; but he has had citizens arrested and imprisoned, then discharged as guiltless, and afterward rearrested and deprived of liberty. Congress was prohibited from making any law “abridging the freedom of speech or of the press;” he has stifled the freedom of speech, and suppressed the circulation of every newspaper of his section which dared to condemn his policy. This has been the fate of the New York Day Book, News, Journal of Commerce, Freeman’s Journal, Brooklyn Eagle, Philadelphia Christian Observer, Westchester (Pa.) Jeffersonian, Bridgeport (Conn.) Farmer, and a long catalogue of others. “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized,” was a solemn assurance of the constitution. But he regarded it with scorn.

He had innocent men and women *seized* in the silent hours of night, by rude and drunken officers. He had houses—which are usually supposed to be castles of freemen—subjected to the unreasonable searches of a blackguard soldiery, fished, for the most part, from purlieus of vice and sinks of degradation. In the seizure of private papers, he went so far as to cause his marshals to make a concerted descent, at three o’clock on a certain afternoon, upon every considerable telegraph office within the compass of his rule, and grasp their accumulated despatches for the preceding twelve months, with a view of ascertaining who were the Northern confidential correspondents of influential men in the Confederate States. “The whole matter was managed with the greatest secrecy, and so well planned that the project was a complete success,” said his most unscrupulous organ next day, in announcing the consummation of the abominable manœuvre. And, to perfect the enslavement of those whom he rules, he had the writ of *habeas corpus* virtually abolished—that sacred privilege which carries the mind of the freeman back to the struggle at Runnymede, and weds the history of the present day to that of the Middle age. It was provided by the constitution that “the writ of *habeas corpus* should not be suspended, unless in cases of rebellion or invasion.” The State of Maryland was not invaded, except by Federal soldiers; neither had she rebelled against the government of the Union; yet, when one of her citizens—Mr. John Merriman—was illegally deprived of liberty, the venerable process issued out in his behalf, and made returnable before the Chief Justice of the

United States, who had administered the oath of office to the President, was contemptuously spit upon by Mr. Lincoln, whose sworn duty it was to guard it; and in every Northern state this writ of freedom is now suspended!

But the tyranny of Mr. Lincoln did not stop with the oppression of individuals; he went so far as to render the hereditary rights of societies nugatory. "Full faith and credit," reads the constitution, "shall be given in each state to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state." But the decrees of state conventions; the enactments of state legislatures; or the proceedings of state courts, have been treated by him of less value than the paper upon which they were recorded. "Nothing in this constitution," adds the same great charter, "shall be so construed as to prejudice the claims of the *United States*, or of *any particular state*" to the territories of the Union. Not one foot of such soil shall ever be given up to the institutions of the Southern states, is the magisterial proclamation of Mr. Lincoln. "No preference shall be given, by any regulations of commerce or revenue, to the ports of one state over another; nor shall vessels, bound to or from one state, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another." His violation of this clause is positively sublime. He has already blockaded the ports and harbors of twelve sovereign states, and caused vessels bound to them to change their course and enter into the ports of other states. "No new state shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other state; nor any state be formed by the junction of two or more states, or parts of states, without the consent of the legislatures of the states concerned, as well as of the congress," reads the noble treaty; but Mr. Lincoln and his government, without the consent of any legislature, have endeavored to erect a new state out of the disloyal counties of Western Virginia, and are now laboring to "form a junction" of the counties of Northumberland and Accomac, Va., with the State of Delaware. The constitution provides that "the citizens of each state shall be entitled to *all* the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states." But to be a citizen of a Southern state, without being a sworn traitor to birth-right, is a sufficient cause for imprisonment and confiscation of property at the North. The war-making power was invested in congress only, yet, without its sanction, or any other legal authority whatever, Mr. Lincoln made war upon the Confederate States. All and every state were prohibited, without the consent of Congress, from engaging in war, unless *actually* invaded or in imminent danger. But without invasion, or danger of invasion, he induced most of the states to make war upon the others. The power of, or right in the Federal government to invade or coerce a state, was refused to the constitution by those the work of

whose souls it was; yet the world beholds to-day the strange spectacle of fourteen sovereignties invaded, or in actual danger of invasion. An army of subjugation is upon Virginia's soil; the tramp of the oppressor's heel is heard upon an inlet of North Carolina; and while these lines are writing, the roar of the invader's cannon calls to arms the sons of the little Spartan state of Jackson and Calhoun.

In Missouri, unparalleled outrages were, and are still being perpetrated. The dignity of the commonwealth was grossly insulted. Her people were stripped of their natural rights and liberties. The solemn enactments of her legislature were nullified and ridiculed. Her militia were disarmed, persecuted, and arrested. Her commerce was suppressed. Her newspapers were silenced. Her children were placed under the espionage of unprincipled men, and handed over to the ruthless mercilessness of an armed soldiery. Her best sons were imprisoned—debarred from the pleasures of home, native fields, and the sweet wooings of nature—without crime and without warrant; and unoffending women and children were barbarously murdered, or shot down like quarry, in her cities. Finally, the state was declared under martial law!

Passing over the fields laid waste—the towns and villages razed or burned—the property stolen or destroyed—the churches desecrated and women ravished in Virginia, we come to Kentucky—a state claimed to be still in the Union. Unfortunately for this chivalrous commonwealth, while influenced by the concerted advice of timid men and false teachers, she resolved upon being an impossibility: she would be neutral, that she might impartially mediate between the unnatural belligerents. But the advocates of neutrality were to her what *Æschines* was to Athens—foxes in the habiliments of lambs. *He* was secretly in league with Philip; *they* were secretly in league with Abraham. They promised fair things—they used specious arguments—they glozed like the serpent, and like the serpent they betrayed. Under the plea of self-protection, they had arms surreptitiously placed in the hands of traitors, to be used against neighbors and fellow-men. Growing bold with temporary success, they had paid mercenaries introduced into, and Federal camps established upon the soil of their own state—the neck of which, by a desperate and cunning stroke, they endeavored to place in the mouth of the wolf. But the people at length awoke, and found that they were entrapped. They beheld their legislature partly venal, partly treacherous, and partly intimidated by military bayonets. They saw that the independent press of their state was either muzzled or silenced. They witnessed loyal citizens hunted like deer or wild fowl, and compelled to seek an asylum of safety in exile. They heard of the arrest at the hour of midnight of eminent

and patriotic statesmen*—men who were venerable from age, and distinguished as public servants during an ordinary lifetime; but whose hands were now pinioned before them, like criminals of ages long past, and carried captive to a military prison in New York, one thousand miles from their homes. But there is a limit to endurance. Young Kentucky took fire and revolted; and that unfortunate state is now precipitated, through the machinations and usurpations of Mr. Lincoln, into a bloody revolution, likely to be unequalled, perhaps, but by one terrible exception, in the annals of history.

In Maryland—unhappy Maryland—his crimes have been still more enormous. There, his uniformed ruffians, in the very dawn of the contest, shot down harmless and defenceless spectators. He had the municipal government of the City of Baltimore subverted. He had the mayor stripped of his legal authority. He had the chief of police, Marshal Kane, arrested and imprisoned. He had the board of police commissioners abolished, and the old police force substituted by a corps of men, many of whose portraits had previously been ornaments in "the rogues' gallery." These base hirelings, without warrant or other judicial sanction, invaded the sanctuary of private dwellings, seized private papers, carried away private property, and arrested inoffensive men. They made war upon the texture of ladies' dresses and children's clothes, when their colors approximated to those of the Confederate flag. The people were disarmed. The state was garrisoned by a Federal force of between thirty-five and forty thousand men, in three divisions, respectively commanded by Generals Banks, Sickles, and Dix.

Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts, is a man whose political life commenced as a democrat, but, being governed by a sordid ambition, he soon became wearied of laboring with an

* From a newspaper in the interest of Mr. Lincoln, the Cincinnati Commercial we gather the following: "Colonel Connell and other officers visited Judge Jackson—one of the bitterest secessionists in Knox county, Ky. He is wealthy and influential, and distinguished himself recently by hospitality to Zollicoffer and his officers, but declined to call upon the Federal officers. Col. Connell and Lieutenant-Colonel Spears, of the First (Federal) Tennessee regiment, concluded to visit him. They called at night, and the family, supposing they came to arrest the judge, were much distressed. * * * After fumbling about the house for some time, a member of the family found a Bible, and the oath was administered with threatening emphasis to Jackson. The judge was required to place his hand on the Bible, and Spears dictated to him the extremest minutiae of an oath which covered the ground entirely, and closed by exclaiming: 'And so, in the name of Almighty God, you do solemnly swear, as you hope for salvation, that you will true allegiance bear to the Government of the United States, *without equivocation or mental reservation.*' When the judge responded affirmatively, Spears ordered him to *kiss* the Bible. The former demurred that the oath was not administered in Kentucky in that way. Spears replied, he 'didn't care a g—d d—n what they did in Kentucky, the Bible must be kissed,' and it was."

And this but a single instance, in illustration of a general and vulgar tyranny.

unprofitable minority, and veered with every change of the popular compass, until he was made a general of division by President Lincoln. Daniel E. Sickles, of New York, is a *person* of yet more unenviable fame.* John A. Dix has had the advantages of a tolerable education and good social intercourse; but nature made him hollow-hearted, cunning, selfish, parsimonious, ungenerous, ungrateful, and unprincipled. His life-Odyssey has been that of a place-hunter. In 1848 he deserted the Democratic party, and, by rebellion, helped to bring upon it disaster and defeat. Next, he professed penitence, and was once more received into its folds; and now we find him allied to his hereditary political foes, an avenging scourge in the service of Abraham Lincoln.

The wrongs inflicted upon a peculiarly sensitive and high-spirited people, by a ribald and undisciplined soldiery so officered, may be more easily conceived than described.† They are subjected daily to insult and abuse—to rapine and murder. Many of the most opulent and estimable sons of Maryland, upon mere suspicion, or to gratify private malice, have been torn from their families and consigned to loathsome dungeons. The writ of *habeas corpus* has been suspended in their midst, and the courts rendered powerless to protect them. The poor of Baltimore have been deprived of the daily rations, supplied to them by the Christian munificence of their fellow-citizen, Ross Winans, who was rewarded for his charity, by Mr. Lincoln, with a cell in a military fortress. General Dix has levelled his cannon at the devoted city, from forts, camps, and entrenchments, with the promise to lay it into ashes in case of an attack being made upon him by the Confederates. During the sitting of the state convention, fearful that it might pass an ordinance of secession, he watched its proceedings like a martinet, and, with the clangor of surrounding arms, intimidated its members, as the notorious Major Sirr sought to intimidate the celebrated Celtic advocate while defending one of the "United Irishmen." Finally, he had the members of the state legislature, supposed

* We omit the personal description of this notorious character.—Ed.

† Dr. William Howard Russell, special correspondent of the London Times, in one of his recent letters to that world-renowned journal, says: "Let the members of the English club picture such a scene as this: A body of men in plain clothes march up to the steps, forbid any one to leave the house, place guards in the hall, take the keys out of the doors, proceed to tear up the floors, to disturb the cellars and throw over the coals—refuse to show any warrant to any of the members, and merely state that they are looking for concealed arms by authority of the marshal, and then leave as they came, without the production of warrant, or showing in dress, uniform or badge, that they are really constables, or employed by any authority whatever. And yet this is what took place at the Maryland club, in Baltimore, the day of my arrival—a club of the most respectable gentlemen in the state—without a word of excuse, explanation or apology. It is not perverting hospitality, nor is it hostility to republican institutions, to condemn such acts as these."

to be loyal to the South, banished or imprisoned, so as to prevent the meeting of that representative body.*

Thus was every vestige of liberty and security to the citizen overthrown—thus were municipal rights cancelled and destroyed—and thus was state sovereignty obliterated by Abraham Lincoln—a man whose sworn obligations were, to protect and preserve each and all—a man who, were it not beneath the dignity of history, one might, in the language of Curran, brand as “the perjurer of an hundred oaths,” who blasts the memory of the dead, blights the hopes of the living, and measures his greatness upon the ruin of his country and the graves of his victims.

But the melancholy feature of this picture is in the singular attitude assumed by the people of the North. It has been severely said of the Scotch, that they sold their king and country for a pittance, which amounted but to four pence a head, for each of their population. If this were truth, and not fiction, surely the conduct of our present adversaries would put the disgraceful transaction in the shade; for, in forfeiting their liberties, they have gained nothing and lost everything. Accustomed to decry and defame all other governments but their own—accustomed to weep over the fate of Greece, Poland and Hungary—accustomed to espouse the cause of Lombardy and Venetia against Austria, the cause of the Papal states against the Pope—they have voted thousands, reckoned by hundreds, of men, and millions of money, to support a despotism, compared with which those of King Bomba and Francis Joseph were balm, in order to crush out a people who keep the vestal flame alive, kindled by Washington and Jefferson!

“There is the moral of all human tales;
’Tis but the same rehearsal of the past,
First freedom, and then glory—when that fails,
Wealth, vice, corruption—barbarism at last.
And history, with all her volumes vast,
Hath but one page.”

Justice may be compatible with monarchy, but never with tyranny. The tyrant feels that justice can always be disputed by force, and he relies upon the power of the latter to wring submission from weakness. The Northern government felt that justice and right were on the side of the South, but, in the consciousness of possessing numbers, brute force, an organized army and navy, bullion, and established authority, it eschewed these facts. Secession, indeed, was revolution; but it was unlike any other revolution of history; it was a revolution of

* No wonder, then, that Lord Lyons, H. B. Majesty’s minister at Washington, in a dispatch to William H. Seward, should have characterized the Lincoln government as a “despotic and arbitrary power,” which “refused to pay obedience to the writ of *habeas corpus*,” and the “irregular proceedings” of which are “contrary to the maxims of the United States.” Indeed, the only wonder is, that that wretched government has not earned for itself the contempt of all civilized mankind.

opinion; not the work of an individual or of a political party, but the natural result and spontaneous desire of a magnanimous people; it was a revolution without a leader, yet a revolution in which all men were leaders—rendering it impossible to sacrifice any one man for an assumed political crime, where all men were alike criminal; it was born of homogeneous sentiments, and designed as a resisting barrier of ancient rights and habits against the contagious encroachments and aggression of new modes of thought in heterogeneous forces; and the height of its Christian ambition was to be bloodless. The South supplicated the North for peace—to borrow the language of Ariosto—in words “which might for pity stop the passing sun.” Past memories were invoked by the former; she appealed to reason; she argued that a Union not founded upon principles of mutual rectitude and benevolence, and not cemented by bonds of love, was unworthy of the name and could not stand; yet, upon the ruins of the structure, men of a common lineage, a common tongue, and a common heritage of historic patriotism, might still meet upon terms of kindness and amity, and pursue, albeit by two different paths, a common career toward a destiny of greatness and splendor. But all this moderation and good faith were answered by threats and execrations: the North resolved upon a policy of blood and carnage—a policy beneath the social economy of animal instinct, and, therefore, unworthy of being termed *brutal*. For he who will enter some fine zoological garden—who will mark the conduct and intercourse of the varied creatures congregated there together—study their leagues of tender and generous friendships—see how they accommodate themselves to the circumstances of their new condition—and then compare their virtuous alliance with the barbarous warfare of the North, will hesitate to rank the *human* with the *brutal* government. We have seen children at a menagerie cultivate with crackers and sweetmeats the friendship of grizzly bears; but the generous leniency of the South served only to lash the North into savage blood-thirstiness. And, surely, the sociological machinery whereby nature regulates the harmony of Barnum’s “happy family,” is higher in the scale of moral self-government than that by which the people of the latter section seek to force the former into submission—the boom of the cannon, the click of the rifle, and the point of the bayonet: But the contrast does not cease here. The lordly lion will roar when in quest of prey; the rattlesnake will warn its victim before it poisons; man alone assassinates; and the North endeavored to lull the South into a slumber of confidence, with the intention of then strangling her.

ART. XIV.—THE PINE TREES OF LOWER NORTH CAROLINA AND VIRGINIA.

Pines made a large proportion of the trees of the primitive forests of the eastern and lower lands of North Carolina and Virginia. And when any of these lands had been cleared and cultivated, exhausted and abandoned, then a new growth of pines formed the universal unmixed cover. As nearly all the lands of lower Virginia had been thus treated, and in succession had reached this second growth, which thus covered all the then poorest and most worthless lands, a general cover of pines, and the term "pine old-fields," came to be generally understood as indicative of the poorest and meanest of lands. For this reason, and also because of the growth of pines being so common and pervading, these trees were not only undervalued, but despised. If a natural forest of various trees was thinned out to make an ornamental grove near a mansion, every noble pine would be certainly cut out, as if a deformity and a worthless lumberer of the ground. In planting trees for the embellishment of homesteads, if any proprietor had selected in part any of our native pines for that purpose, his taste would have been deemed as ridiculous as it was novel and strange. For the most magnificent pines, or the unmixed evergreen of a pine forest in winter, to be admired, it was requisite that the observer should be a stranger, from some distant region, in which pine trees and pine forests were not known. Then, indeed, and in all such cases, their remarkable beauty and grandeur would be fully acknowledged and felt.

All of the many species of pines have the properties of being resinous, bearing their seeds in cones; which, however varying in size and form, have a close general resemblance, and there is a like general similarity of shape, differing from all other trees, of their peculiar evergreen leaves. These spring from sheaths, or are held in clusters of two, three or more leaves to each sheath, according to the species of the tree. The leaves, differing from all others, except of the kindred family of the larch, are long and slender, almost as thick as their width, and of equal diameter throughout their length, except immediately at the extremity, which is a sharp point. The new leaves, as on other trees, grow only on the new twigs (or "water-sprouts") which shoot out in the spring from the last year's buds. But the leaves of the preceding year's growth remain attached to the older branches through a second summer, if not the autumn also. In some species, the leaves sometimes in part remain into the third year before dropping off entirely.

Some of our species of pines are of such distinct and marked appearance that the most careless observer would not fail to distinguish them. Such are the Southern long-leaf pine (*pinus australis*), the Jersey pine (*p. inops*), and the white pine (*p. strobus*). But many farmers who have long lived on cultivated lands, among pines, have not learned always to distinguish other still more common species. And even when this knowledge is not wanting, still there is such confusion and misapplication of the vulgar names of all the kinds, that it is difficult for any one to speak of or to inquire concerning any one pine, by the vulgar name of his own neighborhood, without the name being misapplied by an auditor from another locality. Thus, the name "yellow pine," in different places is used for three different species, of all of which the heart-wood is more or less yellowish. The name "spruce pine" is used in Virginia for one species of pine, and farther south for another. And the several designations of "long-leaf pine," "short-leaf," "old-field pine," etc., are merely terms relative, or used in contrast with other different growths, and are each applied to different kinds in different places. Even the botanical names, though serving generally for exact des-

ignation, in most cases have either no special application, or are entirely erroneous as to their meanings. Such are the designations "*mitis*," "*inops*," and especially "*palustris*," as descriptive terms of species. Further, the qualities and value for timber, and even appearance of pines of the same species, are so much varied by different conditions of situation and growth, that some of the most experienced and intelligent "timber-getters" (or "lumberers") consider as two distinct species, trees which belong to the same. I have, myself, until recently, been under some of these mistakes as to the species with which I had longest been familiar. Under such circumstances I cannot even now be confident of avoiding errors. But even my mistakes (if corrected by others better informed), as well as my correct descriptions and designations, may serve to clear away much of the obscurity and error in which this subject has been involved.

One of the most remarkable and valuable qualities of some of the pines is, that their winged seeds are distributed by winds to great distances, and in great numbers, so that every abandoned field is speedily and thickly seeded, and the kind of pine which is most favored by the soil and situation in a few years covers the ground with its young plants. The growth, especially of the most common second-growth pine (*p. taeda*), is astonishingly rapid, and even on the poorest land. And while other land might still be bare of trees, that which favors this growth would be again under a new and heavy, though young, growth of pines. This offers (especially in connection with the use of calcareous manures) the most cheap, rapid and effectual means for great improvement of poor soils. And besides this greatest end, the cover of the more mature wood, if marketable for fuel, will offer the quickest and greatest return of crop that could have been obtained from such poor and exhausted land.

I will now proceed to remark on each of the several species of pines found anywhere in the region in view, and will commence with such as are most easily and certainly to be distinguished, before treating those less distinguishable, or in regard to which there may yet remain any doubt or uncertainty.

The Long-Leaf or Southern Pine. Pinus Australis of Michaux, Palustris of Linnaeus.—The name *palustris*, notwithstanding its high authority, is altogether inappropriate, as this pine prefers dry soil, and is rarely seen, and never in perfection, on wet or even slightly moist ground. *Australis* is peculiarly appropriate, as this tree is limited to a southern climate.

This species barely extends a few miles north of the southern boundary of Virginia, in the southeastern counties of Southampton and Nansemond. Few, if any, stand in the lower and wetter lands of the more eastern counties in the same southern range. The long-leaf pine prefers dry and sandy soils, and is found, almost without interruption, says Michaux, "in the lower Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida, over a tract of more than six hundred miles, from northeast to southwest, and more than one hundred miles broad;" but not (as that author also says) from the sea to the mountains, or near to either, in North Carolina. In that state it extends westward not much higher than the falls of the rivers, and toward the sea no farther than the edge of the broad border of low, flat and moist ground. Its general and best growth also equally indicates a sterile soil. The mean size, sixty to seventy feet high, with a nearly uniform diameter of fifteen to eighteen inches for two-thirds of the height. Some trees are much larger and taller. Leaves ten to twelve inches long (fourteen and more on some young trees),*

* I have since found and measured leaves nineteen and a half inches long, in Barnwell, South Carolina.

growing in threes (to each sheath), and about one-sixteenth to one thirteenth of an inch in breadth. The cones from seven to eight inches long, and two to two and a half broad before opening of the scales or seed-covers, or four inches when spread open.*

ART. XV.—WHAT WE ARE GAINING BY THE WAR. VIRGINIA.

LYNCHBURG.—The following branches of business have been commenced since the commencement of the existing war:

One envelop factory has been established—one for the manufacture of blacking, and one for making lucifer matches. The manufacture of caps and hats is also being carried on quite extensively. Other factories will be established in a few days. In the neighborhood several tanneries have been established, and the tanning of leather is being carried on quite extensively.

ABINGDON.—Sixteen miles from this place the saltworks are located, where they are manufacturing about two thousand bushels salt per day (twenty-four hours), and are putting up furnaces to increase the amount.

Across the Tennessee line, and about fifteen miles south of us, they have several iron forges, with the greatest abundance of the best ore, and one furnace, where they make a large amount of castings and pig iron.

MADISON.—The only branch of manufacture which has sprung up in this county during the existing war, and which did not previously exist, is a boot and shoe factory, recently started by John Leech & Co. They have, I understand, a government contract for shoes, and I notice that they have advertised for fifty shoe makers.

LOUISA C. H.—There are eight yards in the county, where hides are tanned into leather—the largest employs five hands. Will put in tan for the next season fifteen hundred hides; heretofore, tanned about one thousand hides. The owners of the other yards will, no doubt, increase their operations in about the same proportion. There are fifteen shops where shoes are made. Shoe making in this county, heretofore, has been to supply the neighborhood demand, mainly. It will be stimulated by the high prices now obtained.

There are three shops at which saddles and harness are made. This branch of industry has decreased, owing, I suppose, to the large number of our men being absent in the army, and the difficulty of getting, as well as the high price of materials.

FINCASTLE.—No additional manufactures have sprung up in our midst since the commencement of the war, with the exception of a furnace for the manufacture of iron, which had ceased before the war but has since been revived.

CHARLOTTESVILLE.—Charlottesville Factory Company, John A. Marchant, manager, established in the year 1840. Suspended from 1852 to April, 1855, by breaking of the dam. Now spins cotton and wool, and manufactures them into cloth suitable for soldiers' and laborers' wear. Has fifteen hands employed; could be increased so as to employ fifty hands; prevented by the want of cotton and wool and the article *card clothing*.

* As soon as space admits we shall publish the remainder of this description of the Long Leaf Pine, and of all the other varieties existing at the South.—Ed.

The difficulty in procuring wool and cotton is in the transportation from Texas and the South, where both articles are believed to be abundant. The article of *card clothing* is believed not to be manufactured in the Confederate States.

Buckeye Land Factory, ten miles from this place. Manufactures cotton and woolen goods. B. C. Flannagan & Co. Employs forty hands. No increase within the last year; rather a decrease for the want of card clothing and travellers in spinning cotton. No complaint for the want of wool and cotton.

Scottsville Manufacturing Company, twenty miles from this place. Established in the last eight or nine months. Employs twenty-five hands. Manufactures woolen goods.

McKennie & Co.—Manufactures Swords. Established last July within one mile of this place. Has four hands employed. Manufactures six swords a week; intends to increase.

T. D. Driscoll—Manufactures Swords. Established within the last few months at Howardsville, twenty-five miles from this place. Makes twenty-eight a week.

William Jefferies—Saddle and Harness maker. Established here in 1827. Employs five hands; business diminished; three hands in the army. Can get an abundance of leather tanned in this county. Has manufactured and is now manufacturing cartridge-boxes, belts, cap-boxes and harness for the Confederate army.

A. J. Hudson—Saddle and Harness maker. Established several years ago. Employs three hands. Has manufactured cartridge-boxes, belts, cap-boxes and harness for the Confederate army.

F. A. & T. Hoppe—Shoe and Boot makers. Established one year ago. Employs eighteen hands; number of hands diminished by five in the army. Make more shoes and boots than formerly, because work more and do not make as much fine work. Leather obtained from this and the adjoining counties. Shoe-thread made in this county.

Thos. R. Bailey & Son—Shoe and Boot makers. Established several years ago. Employ fifteen hands. Do more coarse work than formerly.

—Zimmerman—Shoe and Boot maker. Employs four hands.

D. E. Eger—Shoe and Boot maker. Employs two hands.

Orange O. Peterson—Shoe and Boot maker. Employs two hands.

G. E. Saltzgeber—Hat maker. Established several years ago. Has discontinued the hat making business, because he wants materials that are not manufactured in North America. Has changed his business within the last few months into making caps of all kinds for men and boys. Materials made in the Confederate States. Has seven hands employed.

John Robinson—Manufactures Caps for men and boys. Commenced in June last. Employs six hands.

R. F. Harris—Agricultural Machinist. Established January 1st, 1861. Employs twelve hands. Has a foundry for iron castings, machine shop and blacksmith shop; makes gun-carriages and caissons, horse-shoes and stoves, ploughs and plough castings.

S. R. Sullivan—Carriage and Harness maker. John Le Tellier—Carriage and Harness maker. J. A. Via—Carriage and Harness maker. Business of each considerably diminished.

B. C. Flannagan & — Cleveland, within the last few months, have a considerable number of bags made by the women of this place out of cotton osnaburgs.

Spotswood Keller will commence in a few days manufacturing oil-cloth.

There is one tan-yard in this place; many others in the county. The tailoring business has increased in this place.

PORTSMOUTH.—The present war has, however, called out the inventive skill of our people to some extent, and I shall endeavor very briefly to give you a statement in relation to the same.

1. Mr. Thomas W. Cofer, of this city, has, since the commencement of the war, invented and *patented* a revolving pistol, pronounced by judges to be superior to the celebrated Colt pistol. He is engaged at present in manufacturing them on a small scale, as his means are limited.

2. I would also notice the invention of Mr. Thomas Carr, a citizen of this city, for rifling cannon, which has been successfully applied in the navy-yard at this place, and no doubt, in the present crisis of our affairs, has been an invaluable invention to the government.

3. There is also in this city an extensive foundry, originally designed for the building of steam marine, or other engines, upon a large scale. It was the property of A. Mehaffy & Co., of the State of Pennsylvania, and at present is not in operation. The establishment is an extensive one, and as for proof of this I would state that the machinery of the U. S. steamer Powhatan, one of the best vessels in the Federal service, was built there.

4. There is also an extensive sash, door and blind factory here, belonging to Capt. John E. Deans, who is at this time in the army. There are also several establishments of a similar kind on a smaller scale.

5. I would also notice the Union Car Works, of which Capt. George W. Grice is the agent. Their regular business having been, to a great extent, suspended on account of the war, they have been engaged since the commencement of our present difficulties in building gun-carriages, wagons, wheelbarrows, camp-stools, tent-poles and pins, and other implements of war. They have also manufactured sabre-bayonets and bowie-knives for two of the companies from the city, which, considering the *limited facilities* of the establishment, reflect great credit upon all concerned, proving conclusively that we have mechanics in our midst who are equal to any in mechanical skill, and only wait for an emergency like the present to put their knowledge and ingenuity into practical operation.

6. There are also a number of persons in this city and vicinity engaged in the manufacture of bricks and lime; very little doing, however, in business of that kind, as nearly all building has stopped since the commencement of the war.

7. There is also connected with the Seaboard and Roanoke railroad a number of shops, sufficient to do all the work necessary to carry on the road.

NORTH CAROLINA.

WLMINGTON.—*Alcohol* is manufactured to a limited extent—former supplies received from the North—present produce results from the war.

Ashes.—The manufacture of potash in connection with salt-boiling is increasing—none ever made here before the war.

Candles.—Tallow candles are manufactured to a limited extent only—present produce results from the war—former supplies received from the North.

Hay.—The production of this article has increased to a considerable extent since the commencement of the existing war—former supplies were received from the North.

Oils.—Pea-nut oil is now supplied by mills established since the commencement of the war. Rosin oil is also manufactured to a considerable extent—both productions the results of the war.

Salt.—The manufacture of this article by evaporation or boiling is largely on the increase—former supplies were received from the West Indies and England. This branch of manufacture cannot, however, be considered

permanent, as the imported article will always take the place of that manufactured on our coast by the above process.

Shoes are manufactured to a limited extent only. The disposition to extend this branch of manufacture is, however, apparent.

Cutlery.—Sabres, sabre-bayonets and other implements of war, are now being manufactured here for the Confederate government, and the manufacture of various kinds of edge tools, in connection with the above, will be carried on largely as soon as works, now in process of erection, are completed. Other establishments for the manufacture of various kinds of machinery are growing towards completion, and all the results of the war.

CHARLOTTE.—One establishment for the manufacture of linseed or flaxseed oil, with a capacity to turn out five hundred gallons per day, will go into operation by the first of January next. One for the manufacture of cotton seed oil, on a small scale; will turn out about fifty gallons per day; will commence manufacturing in a couple of weeks. One hat manufactory for making soft hats; machinery nearly all ready; will commence in about thirty days; with capacity to make one hundred and fifty hats per day—run by steam. One powder mill, "The North Carolina Powder Manufacturing Company;" will manufacture one thousand pounds per day, with capacity to double the quantity. The state has loaned this company \$10,000. But they are not bound to supply her with powder. Will commence operating by the 16th of January next. These, I believe, comprise all the new branches of manufacture about going into operation in this place and vicinity. In addition, we have in operation two tanneries—one running by steam. One manufactory of woolen goods, averaging five hundred yards per day. One manufactory of cotton yarns, putting up fifty bunches per day. And one cotton and woolen manufactory, situated in the adjoining county, Gaston, twelve miles from here. But the entire amount manufactured there is sold here, and shipped from this point. They average twelve hundred yards of cotton and four hundred of woolen goods per day. Both of these (woolen mills) are engaged by the state in supplying our soldiers with clothing. There are also two leather manufacturing establishments here, that are for working up leather, one of which works fifty hands per day.

GREENSBORO'.—Messrs. Mendenhall, Jones & Gardner, of this place, are now engaged in the manufacturing of guns for the State of North Carolina. This establishment is just getting under way, and it is the intention of the proprietors to manufacture largely so soon as they can get their machinery in operation. In addition to this establishment, the Messrs. Garretts have commenced the manufacture of sewing-machines, pistols, guns, etc. We have also a hat establishment, lately gone into operation, working several hands, with a good prospect for patronage. Besides these, other smaller establishments have sprung up in various parts of the county, for making guns, saddles, shoes, barrels, drums, sashes, etc., all of which promise to be remunerative to those engaged in the enterprise, and to render us independent of the North.

BEAUFORT.—The manufacture of salt has been much talked of—indeed, has been begun, though on a very small scale. The impression is, that it can be made a profitable business at one dollar per bushel; could we believe that the war would continue for a term of years, for much less. The manufacture of salt would be no experiment, as it was made here in 1812, and for a short time after.

MONROE.—Domestic Jeans and Linsey cloth has increased in quantity over one hundred per cent. from about two thousand five hundred yards to about six thousand yards. Some contracts for bayonet-scarbards and straps for knapsacks, etc., and also for cartridge-boxes—from fifteen to twenty-five thousand—have been taken and nearly completed.

Shoe making has also been increased to supply the army demand about twenty-five per cent. Tanneries have increased the quantity of leather about the same, and one steam tannery is in the course of construction, which will increase and extend its former business.

Much of the clothing made from jeans, linsey and other domestic fabrics, have been furnished our soldiers from this section.

One steam saw-mill has been erected last summer and fall. Many pairs of socks have been knit.

People have raised more pork than ordinary, and the grain crops are unusually fine.

Some pistols have been manufactured from rifle barrels; several hundred bowie-knives have been manufactured—two hundred or more. Many guns have been repaired, and one centrifugal (model) gun, proposing to shoot two thousand balls per minute, constructed of wood.

Much grain is raised and sold from this county.

Wool growing would be quite abundant and its manufacture much increased, if the dogs did not kill up the sheep.

Pine lumber and shingles are made in considerable quantities, and several gold mines are in operation in the county, but suffer now from the confiscation act, being mainly owned in whole or in part by Northern men.

CARTHAGE.—It affords me much pleasure to be able to assure you that, since the declaration of our independence of the old United States government, and pending the war, our entire people, with unexampled energy, have recurred to the primeval principles and customs of industry, economy, and frugality, which characterized our ancestors for many years subsequent to the wars of '76 and '12. Our men have embarked industriously in making plows, wagons, shoes, tools, and utensils of wood and iron of every description, for domestic purposes; every farmer is putting down his trough or vat for tanning leather. The gun and rifle makers have resumed their wonted art, gone into their shops, forging out barrels and fixing them up, in readiness for service. In an adjacent neighborhood, shoe-pegs are being made, by machinery, in quantities sufficient to meet the demands of the South. In fine, our people are determined scrupulously to live independent of the North, as they are evidencing by their handy inventions. Our women, too, animated with becoming zeal and resolution, to sustain our glorious cause, have put aside their silks, their calicoes, their head-dresses; and covered up their pianos, and have substituted the wheel, the cards, the loom, and are fostering a commendable spirit of emulation in making the largest number of yards, and the neatest patterns of checks, and stripes for themselves and their little ones, and the substantial jeans to clothe their husbands, their sons and their brothers in the army, and then for gratuitous distribution to any needy soldiers. They are, without distinction of circle or property, all united in constant and useful engagements in getting up domestics of every kind to add to their comforts at home and supply our army with blankets, clothing, and neat caps, hundreds of which our handy women are making in our town and vicinity. Defend us with your bayonets and we will sustain you with our needles, is the watchword with them.

ROCKINGHAM.—The Richmond Manufacturing Company existed here before the war, but has been enlarged by adding a woollen factory to it. They are now making cotton yarn, cotton cloth of various kinds, and woollen goods suited to the necessities of the army.

In this county, Richmond, Mr. Murdoch Morrison is engaged in making bowie-knives, and has made a few pistols, but his operations are on a small scale.

CHARLOTTE.—We have four sets of machinery at the Rockland woollen mills in active operation, and, since April last, have been exclusively en-

gaged in producing goods for our troops at the rate of about four thousand yards per week. Last year we erected an additional building, and procured from the Northern machine manufacturers all the heavy and expensive machinery necessary to start two sets more, besides a considerable amount of cotton machinery.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

SPARTANBURG.—The firm of John Bomar & Co., now own what was formerly called the Bivingsville Cotton Manufacturing Establishment, of about one thousand five hundred spindles, twenty-six looms, wool-carding machine, with all the necessary preparations; besides, a good machine shop, well fitted up with turning lathes (five in number), cog cutter, plainer, upright drill, etc.; also, grist and flouring mills, blacksmith shops, saw-mill, cupalo furnace, cotton gin, wheat thresher, a good grain farm, on about one thousand four hundred acres of land, well improved in good buildings and operators' houses—all forming a very pretty little village of about one hundred and fifty inhabitants. This location is on Lawson's Fork creek, a bold stream of the Packolet river one and a half miles from the Spartanburg and Union railroad, and six miles east of Spartanburg village. The water privilege is hardly equalled in the state, having two very superior water-falls, in either of which the water, by a short canal, will rise to an elevation of thirty to forty feet—all the buildings can be placed beyond the reach of high-water mark (entirely safe). The upper water-fall is so formed by nature as to need no dam, and the water cannot by any improvement on it be retarded from flowing down the stream in ten or twenty minutes at a time; the same may be said of the lower shoal, they are about five or six hundred yards apart—water entirely sufficient to operate extensive machinery, both in cotton and wool, each being at a separate place, very convenient to each other. These privileges, if improved to their capability, are sufficient to turn off from one hundred and fifty to two hundred thousand dollars worth of goods per annum, and sustain a population of five to six hundred inhabitants. The sufficiency of these would *tell well* for the people of the Southern Confederacy, but as it now stands the improvements are very limited, and the operation equally so,* owing, in part, to the great difficulty of getting oil suitable (fine oils); also, card clothing and other incidentals which are not made South, and we fear will, eventually, check our operations down to a low figure. Winter strained sperm, paraffine and kerosene oils, are all that is about suitable—any oils that are fine and clear of *gum*.

LAURENS.—All the old manufactures which may be gathered from the last census have recurred, and have been infused with additional life, and are now working to the extent of their means, more particularly the manufacture of shoe-leather; and the ladies of the country, generally, are making a great quantity of most excellent cloth, of various descriptions, for men's wear, children, negroes, and even for their own wear, which are now taking the place of fine *delaines and silks*. We have some fine shoals in Laurens district, and it is hoped that capital will be employed in using such places for the benefit of our Confederacy, and that this war will arouse every man in it in the development of all our resources, which may tend to make us independent of the word, and especially of the Yankees.

The ladies in one battalion in our district, recently furnished for the uniforms of one company of volunteers three hundred and fifty yards of very nice jeans, five hundred yards of flannel, and three hundred and fifty pairs of socks, in a very short time, made upon the old-fashioned hand-loom, which are numerous in this country, one in almost every family; and some

of the cloth for *service* is equal, if not superior, to the best broad cloth, which only costs from one dollar to one dollar and fifty cents per yard.

CHESTER C. H.—*Every household* has become a manufacturing establishment; the hum of the spinning-wheel may be heard in every hamlet, and the rattle of the loom sings the song of better times to our glorious South. Old and young, rich and poor, of our females, are daily discarding the baser fabrics of Yankeedom, and are bending their whole energies to keep us supplied with warm clothing, raised and made by their own industry. In *our* community, we are abundantly supplied with all the necessary fabrics for our men in the field, and our families at home. Arrangements are now making for extensive operations in the spring and summer. By the indomitable energies of our noble and patriotic women, we will be enabled to steer clear of Yankee nostrums for the *future*, and learn to depend upon our own industry for a subsistence.

EDITORIAL.

THE CRISIS—THE PEOPLE'S DUTY.—An address has been sent forth to the people of Georgia, over the signatures of Howell Cobb, Robert Toombs, and others, which should be adopted as the war cry for the people of the whole Confederacy.

The enemy must be met, and that quickly, and upon a hundred fields. His vandal hordes must be repulsed—his infamous designs upon us must be frustrated. The liberties bequeathed to us by a glorious ancestry must be preserved. Failing in these, death and desolation should be joyously courted as blessed boons in exchange for dishonor and subjugation!

Who will falter in this the hour of his country's direst need?

In regard to the policy of the torch, we have this to say: Let it be used in every instance where protection and supplies can be cut off from the enemy, and his power of evil can be restricted. As to our glorious old cities, the growth of generations of time, let us save them by the valor of our men; and, if lost, redeem them by the blows we shall strike from interior fastnesses, as did our forefathers in 1776. *The torch will be useless here.* We extract:

"The foot of the oppressor is on the soil of Georgia. He comes with lust in his eye, poverty in his purse and hell in his heart. He comes a robber and a murderer. How shall you meet him? With the sword at the threshold—with death for him or for yourself. But more than this—let every woman have a torch, every child a fire-brand. Let the loved homes of our youth be made ashes, and the fields of our heritage be made desolate. Let blackness and ruin mark your departing steps, if depart you must, and let a desert, more terrible than Sahara, welcome the vandals. Let every city be levelled by the flame, and every village be lost in ashes. Let your faithful slaves

share your fortunes and your crust. Trust wife and children to the sure refuge and protection of God—preferring even for these loved ones the charnel house as a home, than loathsome vassalage to a nation already sunk below the contempt of the civilized world. This may be your terrible choice, and determine at once, and without dissent, as honor and patriotism and duty to God require.

Fellow-citizens: Lull not yourselves into a fatal security. Be prepared for every contingency. This is our only hope for a sure and honorable peace. If our enemy was to-day convinced that the feast herein indicated would welcome him in every quarter of the Confederacy, we know his base character well enough to feel assured he would never come. Let, then, the smoke of your homes, fired by women's hands, tell the approaching foe, that over sword and bayonet they will rush only to fire and ruin.

We have faith in God and faith in you. He is blind to every indication of Providence, who has not seen an Almighty hand controlling the events of the past year. The wind—the wave—the cloud—the mist—the sunshine and the storm, have all ministered to our necessities, and frequently succored us in our distresses. We deem it unnecessary to recount the numerous instances which have called forth our gratitude. We would join you in thanksgiving and praise. 'If God be for us, who can be against us?'

Nor would we condemn your confident look to our armies, when they can meet with a foe not too greatly their superior in numbers. The year past tells a story of heroism and success, of which our nation will never be ashamed. These considerations, however, should only stimulate us to greater deeds and nobler efforts. An occasional reverse we must expect—such as has depressed us within the last few days. This is only temporary.

We have no fears of the result—the final issue. You and we may have to sacrifice our lives and fortunes in the holy cause—but our honor will be saved untarnished, and our children's children will rise up to call us 'blessed.' "

Speaking of the *war finances of the Yankee government*, Mr. Stevens, of Pennsylvania, said, the government had authorized a loan of \$250,000,000, of which \$150,000,000 were taken at from 4 to 7½ per cent. and \$50,000,000 were used in demand notes, payable in coin. Before the banks had paid the last of their loan of \$50,000,000, they broke down under it and suspended specie payments. The remaining \$50,000,000 of the loan it has proved impossible to negotiate.

Thus have the Yankees exhausted themselves in the matter of loans. What is now their resort? We shall follow Mr. Stevens, who sees no relief to the government except by violating the constitution in making treasury notes a *legal tender*. He says:

"The daily expenses of the government are now about 2,000,000. To carry us on till the next meeting of Congress, would take 600,000,000 more, making, before legislation could be had, about 700,000,000 to be provided.

The grand question is, how can this large amount be raised? The Secretary of the Treasury has used his best efforts to negotiate a loan of about 50,000,000, and has failed. Several modes of relief have been suggested. The most obvious is to borrow on government bonds bearing an interest of six per cent., which it is known can only be effected by putting the bonds into the market to the highest bidder. If but a small sum were wanted it might probably be had at a small discount, but if sufficient to meet our wants up to next December, 700,000,000, were forced into the market as it is wanted, I have no doubt they would sell as low as sixty per cent. as in the last war. And even then it would be found impossible to find payment in coin. A large part of it must be accepted in the depreciated notes of nonspecie-paying banks; for I suppose no one expects the resumption of specie payment until the war shall be ended. But as this Congress must provide for appropriations to the end of the fiscal year 1863, seven months more must be added to these expenses. That would require 420,000,000, added to the 700,000,000 before estimated, and the aggregate would be 1,100,000,000. The discount on that sum, at forty per cent. would be 440,000,000. At the minimum discount that any reasonable man could fix, say twenty-five per cent. it would be

275,000,000. It would, therefore, require at least bonds to the amount of 1,350,000,000 to produce sufficient currency to make 1,100,000,000 and carry us to the end of the next fiscal year.

This sum is too frightful to be tolerated."

COINS, WEIGHTS AND MEASURES IN THE CONFEDERACY.—We are indebted to the Richmond Examiner for the following, which forms an interesting *addendum* to the paper published by us last fall, by a citizen of Virginia, upon the commercial enfranchisement of the South:

"Whose is this image and superscription?"

"The answer to this question settled the nationality of the place at which the interrogatory was put; the piece of money, the coin of the country, had upon it the image of Cæsar; it was the current coin, the money of Syria, and it was the evidence of the government to which they should pay tribute—a simpler elucidation could not have been found. It settled the question of their obedience, their subjugation, and of their duty to obey their sovereign's demand. This fact announces, in plain terms, that every nation should indicate its existence by its own coins. Have we any? The Confederate States have no coins. There is no legal unit (for a dollar) of the Confederate States. A five franc piece, by the Act of March 9th, 1861, is declared to be worth ninety-five cents, and a Mexican and United States dollar to be worth one hundred and two cents. On the 9th of March, 1861, a law was passed requiring that suitable dies should be prepared for the coins of the Confederate States, but nothing has been, as yet, done upon the subject. The relative value which gold and silver bear to each other, as well as what ought to be their relations in our circulating medium, are to be declared. By the Act of 1837, the United States government made the value of gold to be sixteen to one; it had been fifteen to one by the Act of 1793. The alloy is inexact in the coins of Great Britain and the United States, and, indeed, of all nations except the French. The sovereigns of Great Britain are finer than the French Napoleons; the Mexican and United States silver dollars are finer than the French five franc pieces. The object of all alloy, that is, durability as well as exactness, is secured better by the policy of the French government, by making their coins out of a mixture—one-tenth

of which is of an inferior metal, copper, with their gold or silver coins, and in the copper coins ninety-five copper, four of tin, and one of zinc. The real value of a kilogramme of gold is thirty-one hundred francs; in silver two hundred francs; in copper ten francs. A centime, in copper, weighs one gramme; a franc, silver, five grammes; twenty centimes, silver, one gramme. The franc, their unit, may be very easily converted into a standard of either a weight or a measure, as it is 23-1,000 of a metre across its face, and is just 1,200 parts of a kilogramme, the commercial unit of weight. The questions which might arise with a nation respecting any change in their coins ought not to be considered with us, as we begin our existence, and ought to seek the true standard and adopt it. If we make silver our unit in our coins, then we should find the simplest weight and make the coin to contain a decimal of the mixture, which itself should possess decimal proportions of alloy and pure silver. The same course should be pursued if we take gold. The names to be applied to these coins should be expressive of the nation. We have the words Confederate, state, county, which could be easily used without any violence to the customs of our people. The questions once settled as to the unit, the names are simple, and the decimal being the divisions, of course custom would soon regulate the balance. One thing is, however, certain, that nothing can reconcile the people to any other than a decimal system in their currency; and if any argument were needed in favor of a decimal system of weights and measures, this very fact that, after a trial of the principle in the currency, the experience of the whole population approves of it entirely, would answer every objection against the adoption of a decimal system in our weights and measures.

Moses said, 'Do not any unjust thing in judgment, in rule, in weight, or in measure; let the balance be just and the weights equal; the bushel just, and the sextary equal.' The impossibility of being exact in our weights and measures, with our present system, will be made apparent by the statement of a few facts: A grain of wheat taken from the middle of the ear, well dried, is the standard which starts the pound troy, as follows; 24 grains a pennyweight (an old silver coin of Great Britain being of that weight), 20 pennyweights an ounce, and 12 ounces a pound. In avoirdupois weight there is no starting-point, except that, by an Act of Parliament, 10 grains make one scruple and 3 scruples a drachm, 16 drachms

an ounce, and 16 ounces a pound, in the same natural object. In apothecaries' weight we have a long string of names suitable for doctors and quacks to call over or write out for the apothecary, but there is no meaning to any of these several words out of the pursuits to which they relate. A grocer is, by his profession, a stranger to the weights of the apothecary, and the silversmith would do a poor business if he adopted the weights of the grocer or the apothecary, as he must use troy weight or diamond weight; but yet we teach our children all of these tables, and they are all in use amongst our people without any advantage, but very great trouble, and not unfrequently with blunders and mistakes, and never with positive exactness. Since twenty grains of one field and one variety of wheat will weigh very differently from another twenty grains from another field, and as we are seeking exactness, and as the foundation of the whole system is variable, we should abandon the system as worthless and look for another.

Our measures are equally as objectionable, as a few facts will demonstrate. We have, as the starting-point, or the unit, the inch, defined thus: three barley-corns make an inch, twelve inches a foot, three feet a yard, etc. In many portions of the Confederate States, barley is not known. It being one of the staple productions of England, however, she might apologize for making such an object the basis of her long measures, but for us it has no claims of this kind. In measuring grain, or to speak as the merchants now speak, by dry measure, we have a bushel in name, but the thing used is a half bushel, with but few exceptions. Ten pounds of distilled water is a gallon, and eighty pounds of distilled water is a bushel—this measure is, of course, dependent upon the wheat grain, and that being variable, the standard which we have derived and is in use must be defective. Our liquid measures are divided and subdivided so singularly as to require familiarity, in absolute use, to make us recollect them. Four gills a pint, two pints a quart, four quarts a gallon, etc. Cubic measure is a real difficulty; let us state it: 1,720 inches a foot, 27 feet a yard, 12 cubic feet a ton of shipping, etc. Our square measures are, of course, bottomed upon the divisions of inches, feet, yards, etc. An acre is a quantity of land in which there are 4,840 yards square, or 160 square rods or perches, and which it takes a surveyor to ascertain with certainty. So difficult and treacherous are all our weights and measures that, in almost every article of building, and for

every piece of work done by house carpenters or railway builders, or land sold, the sworn professional weigher, measurer or surveyor is essential before the simplest settlement can be made between neighbor and neighbor. We have in each state a page or two, and in some, doubtless, more, of laws upon the subject of weights and measures, all of which are bottomed upon a standard derived from the United States, and they obtained their standard from England, and she had hers from the sources already alluded to.

Now, is there any real, unchangeable, fixed and exact standard existing in nature capable of being used instead of those we now have? If so, the simplest understanding must determine in favor of its adoption. The fact that the earth has been already measured, and that its proportions are definitely ascertained and applied to weights, measures and coins, furnishing every required advantage, has been announced by the highest scientific authority in the world—the French Academy of Science. A history of the facts connected with the affair is of the highest importance, and, with such materials as are at command, we may gather all of the imposing results of this interesting application of science to the commerce of the world. In 1790, Talleyrand obtained from the Constituent Assembly, of which he was a member, an order that the Academy of Sciences should found a metrical system based upon nature and suitable for acceptance by all nations. The academy fixed the unit at the ten millionth part of the terrestrial meridian—a measurement having been made by Sacaille, in Peru; but another line was measured, passing through France, extending from Dunkirk to Barcelona, and, afterward, northward through England and Scotland—and from the Isle of Wight southward, through Spain, to the Island of Formentera. This giant achievement, during the throes of revolution, was participated in by other nations at the invitation of the provisional government. This commission was composed of the following persons: Berthola, Borda, Brisson, Laplace, Lefevre-Gineau, Legendre, Meham, Monque, Prony and Vandermonde, members of the Institute of France; Aenæ and Van Swirden, sent by the Republic of the Netherlands; De Balbo, by Sardinia; Bugge, by Denmark; Ciscar and Pedrayes, by Spain; Fabbroni, by Tuscany; Franchini, by the Roman republic; Mascheroni, by the Cis-Alpine republic; Mulledo, by the Laguyrian republic; Tralles, by the Swiss confed-

eration; Vassalli, by Piedmont; Lenoir, a French artist, who executed the metre and apparatus relative to it; and Fontiá, also a French artist, author of programme and its apparatus. Jillet Lavoisier and Gen. Meunier took an active part for only a short period, unfortunately. This committee, after suitable verification, reported the metrical system of measures, and the weights were deduced from the metre with the new coins, constituting five units, as follows:

A metre—1-10,000,000 of the distance from the equator to the pole.

An are—100 square metres.

A sterb—1 cubic metre.

A gramme—1-100 of a metre of water, the unit of weight.

A litre—1-10 of a meter square.

These names are very simple, and are invariable, and one reveals the other. The coins are of different weights, and measure certain proportions of a metre, as has been stated before. Now, the question arises, can we in the Confederate States adopt a metrical decimal system in lieu of the one which the Yankees use? The great change wrought in our currency was Mr. Jefferson's work, by which a decimal currency was substituted in the place of our confused pounds, shillings and pence. May we not, with perfect propriety, carry into our weights and measures the very same principle which we have so much reason to see is the simplest and the best in our currency. The names of the new weights and measures, as well as our coins, may need some very immaterial changes, and the revolution in our whole social and commercial and literary existence becomes as great as that in our political relations has been. Why may not the congress, now in session, pass a resolution authorizing the president to appoint a committee of one or two gentlemen, of known intelligence, from each state, to prepare a system, embracing the decimal metrical principles, and dissolving our language in commercial intercourse from the Yankee language, because it is a better one and a purer tongue. Let us of the Confederate States adopt it, drawing from the earth on which we tread the system by which we will buy or sell, and teaching, in every business transaction, by the image and superscription on the coin we may use, that we are a race of men affirming our nationality, and in our weights and measures declaring that we obey the great Jewish Lawgiver—the balance being just, the weights equal, the bushel just, and the sextary equal.

The Preparation of War Material.

COLUMBIA, February 15, 1862.

To the Editor of the Charleston Mercury:

It is necessary that we should, as promptly as possible, develop all the resources within our reach, and rely, as far as practicable, on ourselves for our security and defence. Among the immediate and pressing wants which a people engaged in war constantly experience, is the rapid and abundant and unfailing supply of all the materials of war. All of these are within our reach and among ourselves, and with the application of a little energy and intelligence, can readily be put at our command. I write this communication with the view of exciting into full play the energy and intelligence which abounds in the state. On the subject of nitre, I ask especially the aid of the professors of the South Carolina College and that of the chemists of Charleston. If we can obtain an abundant supply from the cellars and sinks of the burnt district, our heavy loss will not leave us without some small compensation. The sulphur and the willow coal can be easily obtained, and if we can procure nitre, we will soon be independent of foreign or Confederate action for our supply of powder.

A friend has, at my request, prepared a short paper which sets forth some of the resources at our command, and the easiest mode of developing them. I request you to publish that paper, which I send you, in conjunction with this. As soon as the practicability of the scheme is demonstrated, I will advertise for contractors to supply these materials.

Most respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

JAMES CHESNUT, Jr.,
Chief of Department of the Military.

Sulphur.—This can be obtained from iron pyrites and copper pyrites by roasting.

Every hundred pounds of iron pyrites will yield, by the simplest process of

roasting, from twelve to fifteen pounds of sulphur (crude).

Process.—Have a series of conical clay pipes capable of containing from fifty to one hundred pounds of broken ore each. Place them in an inclined position, having the smaller ends projecting into a trough of water, and apply fire beneath. The sulphur will pass over in vapor into the water, and then condense in the form of crude sulphur. The tubes could be arranged over a flue, like the flue of a brick-kiln. You cannot by this process get out more than a quarter of the sulphur from the ore—for if you heat it above redness, the ore will melt, and this will involve the necessity of having new pipes each time. But this one-quarter of the sulphur is equal to about twelve or fifteen pounds for iron pyrites, and about the same for copper pyrites, which always contain large quantities of iron pyrites.

A rougher process would yield well, viz: Have a square brick hearth—pile up billets of wood, and then pile the broken ore on it in pyramidal form, cover it with earth, leaving a tube at top for the vapor to pass over into some receptacle filled with water—then burn the wood, setting the ore on fire. By a more refined process, one hundred tons of copper pyrites has been made to yield thirty tons of sulphur and two tons of copper. But this involved the use of sixty tons of coal in order that the vapor (sulphurous acid) which we lose by the rougher process may be passed over the flame of the coal and be converted back into sulphur, to be collected into other condensers—(the sixty tons coal was not additional, but was all used in the heating, and the subsequent process). This process paid the manufacturer \$1,000 nett for the one hundred tons, after deducting all expenses. This more refined method might be instituted in the immediate vicinity of the North Carolina coal mines. But we must rely on the simpler processes.

Of course, the crude sulphur must be refined by a second process in all cases, which will involve, however, very slight additional expense.

Localities of Pyrites.—On examination of Tuomey's and Lieber's reports on the Geology of South Carolina, we find the following mines (worked for other purposes) rich in iron or copper pyrites: Wilson mine, seven miles northeast of Yorkville, Lieber; Hagin mine, in Lancaster district, Lieber; Massy Copper mine, five miles from Yorkville, Lieber; Cowpen's Furnace, in Spartanburg district, Tuomey; Hale's mine, in Lancaster district, Lieber (very abundant),

Tuomey. And I have no doubt there are many other places not mentioned by these gentlemen, as an iron pyrite is of so frequent occurrence as to be overlooked in geological reports.

I may state, in conclusion, that the roasted iron pyrites, after we have gotten out all the available sulphur, is easily converted by the action of air into green vitriol, which is used in the manufacture of sulphuric acid. Now, we cannot get nitric acid without using sulphuric to separate it from saltpetre, or its other salts. And nitric acid is used very extensively in the Ordnance Department in the manufacture of percussion-caps, etc. Nor are the many other uses of sulphuric acid at a time like this to be overlooked.

Saltpetre.—The caves in Alabama and Tennessee may yield a considerable amount. But I would predict that they will not yield enough for the war purposes of the South. The chief sources of earth-containing nitrates are in tropical climates, though considerable amounts have been found in the Temperate zone; still, it would seem our climate is not so well adapted to its natural production. The process of saltpetre plantations is slow and troublesome, but they may become a necessity.

Process.—On a clay floor place a layer of loose earth, some four or five inches thick; then on this rank weeds, mushrooms, pea-straw, fodder; then solid animal refuse, mud from streets and stagnant pools, dung, etc., to a height of some feet, and then a layer of loose earth; water this constantly with urine and water from cess-pools. Then, at the end of twelve months or more, stop the application of liquids for a short interval, and the upper layers will be found impregnated with saltpetre and other nitrates. By this process, the dung of twenty-five cattle produced, in four years, one thousand pounds of saltpetre (or rather the process was alternate layers of dung and earth about four inches thick, and the whole watered with the urine or liquid manure). The same heap will continue to yield for ten years, by replacing the earth taken from the top layers, by first material. I forgot to say that this heap of earth and refuse should be protected from sun and rain by a shed. The earth impregnated thus with nitrates must be treated in a common hopper, as we treat ashes to make lye. The lye obtained must have the lye of ashes added to it to convert all the nitrates into saltpetre; then boil down, and we get the crystal of crude saltpetre.

It seems that, perhaps, so long a process is little applicable to our present

necessities. But a notice a year ago that a proportion of the war tax would be received in saltpetre would have helped the planter and the government. Then, again, by looking at the process, we must see that we have been making a great deal of saltpetre without knowing it, and the soil of stable floors and corn sheds of long standing might well repay an examination. The cities, with their necessary filth, must produce the nitrates in considerable quantities, and the scrapings of the floors and cellars in the burnt district of Charleston might be examined by the practical chemists of that city. They would no doubt find the earth impregnated to several inches with nitrates in many places, and this earth could be subjected to the lye process. The objection might be made that the yield would be small. But if gunpowder be a necessity, it is no time to ask whether a process for making it pays.

Refining.—The crude saltpetre has so many impurities, and these impurities so deleterious to the effectiveness and good keeping of the powder, that I would think it best to have the refining under government inspection, though the process is simple. And, again, although the *eprouvette* may show the force of the powder up to the standard, still the presence of these impurities in the saltpetre may cause it to spoil very easily by the absorption of moisture.

This information, and much more on the subject of saltpetre and sulphur, can be found in *Knapp's Technology and Gmelin's Hand-book of Chemistry*.

The Mason-Slidell Federal Diplomacy Burlesqued.

THE CHICKEN QUESTION.

The following excellent burlesque version of a celebrated piece of Yankee diplomacy, has been done into verse for the Charleston Courier by a gentleman who stands very high in the literary circles of the South (we attribute it to him), Wm. J. Grayson, Esq. It is worthy of a place in the records of the times, and will furnish not a little amusement to our posterity. Secretary Seward, Minister Adams and Commodore Wilkes have their appropriate places in the picture.

I.—*Snack to Addums.*—[Extract.]

CHICKEN DEPARTMENT.

Apeland, December 30, 1861.

Friend Addums, I know you are pert as a spoon.
And can bamboozle Bull, morning, evening and noon;

Go at it—for now, by the sharp Yankee tricks
 Of a cute, dashing lad, we are all in a fix—
 You know him: he went to some outlandish
 const,
 Made a book that's as long as his voyage almost,
 And lately he plundered Bull's coop, and took
 four
 Of Cornfed's smart roosters, he found there, and
 swore
 That but for the toting, his strength being
 small,
 He'd have taken Bull's coop with his chickens
 and all.
 Now, if Bull makes a row, keep a bright, close
 look-out.
 It was not by our order the thing came about—
 Whisper this in his ear, and just add, if you
 please,
 That on all sides we're flogging young Cornfed
 with ease:
 It's a lie; but don't mind it, why should you, I
 pray.
 When at home we are lying like thunder all
 day?

Yours,

W. SNEAK.

II.—*Bull to Lyon.*

BULL PEN, November 30, 1861.

An impudent chap, in the service of Sneak,
 Dared to stone and to plunder my coop, the last
 week.
 Of four clever, good looking cocks that were
 there.
 By my youngest friend Cornfed, consigned to
 my care.
 Just get 'em—d'ye mind me—no humbug, no
 jaw.
 No rignarole stories from Sneak about law:
 Just send me the roosters, and if he's not civil
 And humble, I'll blow all his coops to the devil;
 Yes, damme, I'll lick him, as sure as a gun.
 I've a strong mind to do it, whatever is done.
 I am, etc., BULL.

III.—*Sneak to Lyon.*

CHICKEN DEPARTMENT,

Apeland, December 26, 1861.

My Lord! I have never seen letter so full
 Of kindness, as that you have sent me from
 Bull:
 It is not only civil, but pointed and neat,
 And belongs to the order we call short and
 sweet.
 He says, but I need not repeat "doubtlessly,"
 You know it as well, or yet better than I,
 But I'll just run along with the contents in
 part,
 To try and find something to give me a start.
 * * * * *
 'Tis a fact, the lads threw a few stones. I admit.
 Do you think 'twas to hurt your nice coop, not
 a bit:
 'Twas no want of affection for you, but to show
 They were sharp after Cornfed's game chickens
 —you know

Game chickens are fighters, and, therefore, the
 race
 Are contraband—these are the "pints" in the
 case:
 First, were the cocks game chickens? Sumner
 can tell.
 I'll ask him the question, he knows the breed
 well;
 But I think the lads ran little danger of blame,
 For the whole of the chickens of Cornfed are
 game.
 Second, mightn't a chap peep into coops, not in-
 tending
 To steal, or do damage, without its offending?
 Of all men I know, you should think so I'm sure.
 For you peep into every coop passing your door.
 Third, when the boys peeped, was it done with
 the art
 And the science of one well informed in his part?
 It was: every rule they were perfect in keeping.
 As if, all their lives, they'd been sneaking and
 peeping;
 The only mishap that befell in the case
 Was, a pullet scratched one of the boys in the
 face.
 Fourth, when the lads saw the game chicks,
 were they right
 To nab 'em—all hen-hussies say that they might.
 Fifth, by all the laws that rule stealins and
 pickens.
 Might they not have grabbed everything, feed,
 coop and chickens?
 Now, here's the rub, that's a fact, and I sorter
 Think, sometimes, they ortent, and sometimes
 they orter.
 Besides, furthermore, "doubtlessly," 'tisn't
 clear,
 So I'm worried and flurried—who says it is fear?
 Who's afraid? but Bull talks in so civil a fash-
 ion,
 When I really did think he would get in a pas-
 sion,
 That I'm bound to return his politeness at least.
 So take the four cocks, you will find them down
 East.
 'Tisn't much that can be crowned by so paltry a
 lot.
 When Cornfed's whole poultry yard's going to
 pot.
 So, my Lord, I'm rejoiced to oblige you, and end,
 My Lord, Mr. Bull's, and your servant and friend.
 W. SNEAK.

IV.—*Lyon to Sneak.*

What fudge! but I've sent it all home, you may
 guess,
 How nice a pet dish it will make for the press.
 I take the four chickens, and when we next
 meet,
 You may hear something from me concerning
 your fleet.
 Your hulks, bought by contract, and loaded
 with stone,
 A thing to all civilized nations unknown—
 To barricade ports, and change lawful blockade
 To a lawless destruction, forever, of trade—
 Such a job, such a base, mean, detestable plan
 Has never, till now, stained the annals of man.
 LYON.